
Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository

5-19-2015 12:00 AM

Voices of Discontent: Avery Brundage and the IOC's Dilemma of South Africa's Olympic Participation, 1956-1968

Michael Capobianco
The University of Western Ontario

Supervisor
Dr. Michael Heine
The University of Western Ontario

Graduate Program in Kinesiology
A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree in Doctor of Philosophy
© Michael Capobianco 2015

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Capobianco, Michael, "Voices of Discontent: Avery Brundage and the IOC's Dilemma of South Africa's Olympic Participation, 1956-1968" (2015). *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. 2876.
<https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/2876>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact wlsadmin@uwo.ca.

VOICES OF DISCONTENT: AVERY BRUNDAGE AND THE IOC'S DILEMMA OF
SOUTH AFRICA'S OLYMPIC PARTICIPATION, 1956-1968

(Thesis format: Monograph)

by

Michael Silvio Capobianco

Graduate Program in Kinesiology

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
The University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada

© Michael Silvio Capobianco 2015

Abstract

Avery Brundage became President of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) in 1952, ready to lead the IOC according to the vision of its modern founder, Pierre de Coubertin. One of the IOC's challenges during Brundage's tenure as President involved the participation of South Africa in the Olympic Movement and Olympic Games. Racial discrimination and segregation, known as apartheid, was rampant in South Africa because of governmental laws and policies. These discriminatory practices, which were ingrained in the South African National Olympic Committee (SANOC), conflicted with principles laid down in the *Olympic Charter*, especially Article 1 forbidding racial discrimination. Due to pressure from the international community, the IOC opposed apartheid by suspending South Africa from the 1964 Tokyo and 1968 Mexico City Olympic Games through IOC policy and procedure, which eventually led to South Africa's expulsion from the IOC, Olympic Games, and Olympic Movement in 1970.

This dissertation explored the debates and correspondence of important actors within the IOC and the Olympic Movement from 1955 to 1968, in the context of the organization's discussion of South Africa's controversial place in the Olympic Movement and Olympic Games. A reconstructionist approach was adopted to examine the relationship between the IOC and SANOC, by investigating specifically the correspondence of key actors in a network of exchanges that centred on Brundage and the IOC. Perspectives and strategies of the actors in this network were traced. The analysis identified three 'dominant voices' in this debate: (1) South African Olympic affiliates; (2) domestic resistance; and (3) a concerned international sport community. Furthermore, three factors that guided the decision-making of the IOC

when determining South Africa's participation in the Olympic Games emerged: (1) IOC rules and regulations; (2) IOC structure and protocol; and, (3) the IOC's stance to remain a neutral party in domestic political issues. This in-depth investigation into the thinking of these central and influential actors contributes a new dimension to our understanding of the IOC's approach to the South African controversy, and the events leading to South Africa's expulsion.

Keywords: Avery Brundage, Olympic Games, International Olympic Committee, South Africa, Apartheid.

Acknowledgements

I must begin with Dr. Michael Heine. Without accepting me as your first doctoral student, after I returned from a year and a half hiatus, I would have not completed my Ph.D. You have my utmost gratitude. There were many faculty members that provided support and guidance along the way. Thank you to Dr. Angela Schneider, Dr. Klaus Meier, Dr. Charles Rice, Dr. Darwin Semotiuk, Dr. Ken Kirkwood, and Dr. Kevin Wamsley. Thank you to Dr. Janice Forsyth for continual access to the Avery Brundage Collection and to Dr. Stephen Wenn for being the external adjudicator for my dissertation defense. To Dr. Robert Knight Barney, I am indebted to your considerate and cordial help, “pushing spirit,” and advice.

I extend my appreciation for the support and assistance from fellow colleagues; especially Dr. Sarah Teetzel and Dr. Charlene Weaving, whom have provided ongoing motivation from the start of my doctoral journey. To my friends and family – thank you for the unconditional support throughout the many, many years. To Paul and Melanie, your little brother is definitely finished. Finally, I am extremely grateful to my parents, Angela and Dominic, for the unwavering encouragement and going beyond what was necessary to provide many, otherwise unattainable, opportunities and creating a comfortable environment for me to succeed in life.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	IV
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	V
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	VIII
CHAPTER ONE: AVERY BRUNDAGE, THE IOC, AND SOUTH AFRICAN RACE POLITICS	1
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Avery Brundage and the IOC's Position on Race and Sport	2
2. Statement of the Research Issue	7
3. The Historical Context of South African Sport and Race Politics.....	9
4. Literature Review.....	22
4.1 Racism and the Olympics.....	22
4.2 Avery Brundage's Life and Work in the Olympic Movement.....	24
4.3 Sport, Racism, and South Africa	28
4.4 Correspondence between Brundage and Officials.....	31
5. Methodology and Methods	37
6. Limitations and Delimitations.....	40
7. Chapter Overview.....	42
Endnotes for Chapter One	45
CHAPTER TWO: AVERY BRUNDAGE, THE SOUTH AFRICAN NATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE, AND THE BIRTH OF THE NON-WHITE RESISTANCE, 1955-1960	53
1. Introduction	53

2. South African Olympic Affiliates.....	55
3. Domestic Resistance	88
4. International Community.....	108
5. Discussion: Developments during the Phase 1955-1960.....	121
Endnotes for Chapter Two	126

CHAPTER THREE: AVERY BRUNDAGE AND THE IOC'S FIRST CONFRONTATION WITH THE SOUTH AFRICAN NATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE, 1960-1964 133

1. Introduction	133
2. South African Olympic Affiliates.....	134
2.1 The Unofficial Correspondence of Ira Emery	163
3. Domestic Resistance	182
4. International Community.....	198
5. Discussion: The Developments from 1960-1964	213
Endnotes for Chapter Three	218

CHAPTER FOUR: SUCCUMBING TO INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL PRESSURE: AVERY BRUNDAGE AND THE IOC, 1964-1968 228

1. Introduction	228
2. South African Olympic Affiliates.....	229
2.1 Ira Emery	245
3. The IOC South Africa Commission	252
4. IOC and NOC Opinions.....	262
5. Domestic Resistance	279
6. The International Community.....	287
7. Discussion: Developments during the Period, 1964-1968	310
Endnotes for Chapter Four.....	317

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	327
1. South Africa, Brundage, and the IOC.....	327
2. Conclusions.....	334
3. Recommendations for Future Research.....	342
Endnotes for Chapter Five.....	344
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 345
1. Primary Sources.....	345
1.1 Archival Sources.....	345
1.2 Institutional Records.....	345
2. Secondary Sources	345
2.1 Articles.....	345
2.2 Books	348
2.3 Book Chapters.....	349
2.4 Theses	349
 CURRICULUM VITAE	 350

List of Abbreviations

AAM	Anti-Apartheid Movement
ABC	Avery Brundage Collection
ACA	American Committee on Africa
BECGF	British Empire and Commonwealth Games Federation
CARDS	Campaign Against Race Discrimination in Sport
FIFA	Fédération Internationale de Football Association
IAAF	International Amateur Athletics Federation
IOC	International Olympic Committee
ISF	International Sports Federation
ITTF	International Table Tennis Federation
NOC	National Olympic Committee
NSF	National Sports Federation
OCHR	Olympic Committee for Human Rights
SAAWBF	South African Amateur Weightlifting and Bodybuilding Federation
SAAWU	South African Amateur Weightlifting Union
SABAACA	South African Bantu Amateur Athletic and Cycling Association
SAC	South Africa Commission
SANOC	South African National Olympic Committee
SAN-ROC	South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee
SASA	South African Sports Association
SCSA	Supreme Council for Sport in Africa
SAPGA	South African Paraplegic Games Association
STST	Stop the Seventy Tour
UN	United Nations

Chapter One:

Avery Brundage, the IOC, and South African Race Politics

1. Introduction

As the fifth President of the International Olympic Committee (IOC), and the only non-European to have held the office to date, Avery Brundage steered the international growth of the organization by expanding its reach to Africa, Latin America, and Asia.¹ Although the Western world still had firm control of the IOC during his tenure as President (1952-1972), the percentage of Europeans and North Americans elected to IOC membership declined by 13.8%. The percentage of Africans and Latin Americans increased by 11.3%. The total number of participating Olympic nations rose to 127 by his retirement in 1972.²

This expansion also created new political issues and challenges for the IOC and the nations represented in it. In particular, the IOC's increasing reach in Africa brought the issue of the organization's position on racism in sports to the forefront, particularly concerning the racial politics of South Africa. Here Brundage played an influential role in shaping the relationship between the IOC and South Africa when the issue of apartheid first arose in the 1950s. The position of Brundage in these developments has been generally summarized. What has not been made explicit and examined in detail are the specific strategies, actions, interventions, and interactions that characterized Brundage's position on these issues, during the crucial time period from 1956 to 1968.

1.1 Avery Brundage and the IOC's Position on Race and Sport

Reflecting on the man behind the IOC presidency could provide some introductory insights into the understanding Brundage brought to the management of controversies during his term in office. Born in Detroit on 28 September 1887, Brundage had a humble upbringing.³ His family eventually moved to Chicago where he was raised by his mother. He attended the University of Illinois to become a civil engineer. During his adolescent and university years, Brundage participated in multiple sports, eventually gravitating towards track and field where he specialized in multiple events. He eventually competed in the 1912 Olympic Games as part of the United States (US) pentathlon and decathlon teams, an Olympic teammate to both Jim Thorpe and George S. Patton.⁴ Subsequent to his athletic career, Brundage devoted himself to the development of amateur sport and its organization in America. On 20 November 1928, Brundage was elected President of the Amateur Athletic Union, where he served through seven terms of office from 1929 to 1936. He served as Vice-President of the International Amateur Athletic Federation from 1930 to 1952. On 19 November 1930, he was elected President of the American Olympic Association, and following the Berlin Olympics in 1936, he replaced Ernest Lee Jahncke as a member of the IOC.⁵ He went on to become the organization's Vice President in 1945, and its President in 1952.⁶

Brundage emulated Pierre de Coubertin's administrative style and shared his vision for the Olympic Movement, which ultimately reflected the force driving the direction of the IOC.⁷ Brundage viewed the Olympic Movement from the perspective of a 'religion' that strongly emphasized ideals of fair play, sportsmanship, and

amateurism.⁸ When Brundage spoke of the Olympic Movement, he emphasized competition and spectacle, but also visualized it as a gathering of individuals from across the world who abided by a single tenet while putting aside differences of race,⁹ religion, and politics.¹⁰ He was the ultimate Olympic idealist, preached the benefits of being a part of the Olympic Movement,¹¹ and was suspicious of those who held membership “for reasons other than allegiance to Olympism.”¹² As the IOC views it today, Olympism’s definition should be based on Coubertin’s ideals:

Olympism is a philosophy of life, exalting and combining in a balanced whole the qualities of body, will and mind. Blending sport with culture and education, Olympism seeks to create a way of life based on the joy found in effort, the educational value of good example and respect for universal fundamental ethical principles.¹³

Aligned with this interpretation of Olympism, Brundage understood the inherent meaning of the Olympic Games to be:

... a demonstration of idealism in action and as such they [the Games] appeal to all people of every country who hope for a better world. They are an enterprise, conducted by devotees, by dedicated individuals, who seek to demonstrate the best and the finest without thought of personal gain. Based on the high principles of the amateur code, they illustrate a system where everyone has an equal opportunity and where the reward is measured by the ability and the application of the participant – a system that is honest, fair, just, and so a system which meets the aspirations of all people.¹⁴

Brundage was explicit in his emphasis on “the zeal with which the International Olympic Committee defends its principles and the firmness of the steps it sometimes has to take” to prevent becoming too “materialistic and politically driven.”¹⁵ He used these standards when selecting new IOC members:

Members are co-opted and selected for their devotion to the Olympic Movement, their international viewpoint, their knowledge of and experience in amateur sport, and their independent spirit. They are ambassadors from the Committee to their countries. It is the man

and not the country that counts. Nations new to the Movement have insisted that they should name a 'representative' on the committee. But the Olympic Games would soon lose all their purpose if they were controlled by a committee composed of members striving to advance the interest of their own country instead of the Olympic Movement. Political considerations would soon prevail and blocs would form within the Committee, which would be incompatible with its rules and principles.¹⁶

Brundage could be seen as an idealist preacher of Coubertin's ideology of the Olympic Movement.¹⁷ His strong personal interpretation of Coubertin's ideals of Olympism influenced his outlook and shaped the direction of the IOC's development. Brundage's insistence on an amateur, non-political, and anti-commercial Movement influenced his dealings when political issues such as the problem of racism and Olympic sports arose.

Brundage was confronted with the issue of racial politics within the Olympic Games well before dealing with the apartheid issue in South Africa. Though the 1936 Berlin Olympics were overshadowed by boycott campaigns to protest racial policies espoused by Hitler and the National Socialists, Brundage himself opposed boycotts, insisting that political issues had no place in the Olympic Movement.¹⁸ Only major infractions against the Olympic mission would sway Brundage from his position to endorse American participation in the 1936 Games.¹⁹ However, the true reasons for his support of the Berlin Games will always be in question because of anti-Semitic remarks that came to light in letters to his friends; neither was he shy in his support for the German government's promotion of Nazi state physical education.²⁰ Some three decades later, according to Sam Ramsamy:

An Olympic Committee for Human Rights (OCHR) was formed to lobby for a black American boycott of the 1968 Olympic Games, openly accusing Brundage of being a racist. The committee

demanding the removal of Avery Brundage from his post as President of the International Olympic Committee. The OCHR exposed the fact that at the time Brundage owned the Montecito Country Club in Santa Barbara, California which in fact excluded Jews and Blacks from membership. Brundage also displayed sympathy for the white South African National Olympic Committee.²¹

Brundage rejected the accusations of being anti-Semitic and anti-black. In a cogent overview, Maynard Brichford pointed out some of the race issues confronted by Brundage during his career; ranging from the removal of the 1920s track and field championships from New Orleans to employing blacks and Jews in his businesses.²²

Brundage was not averse to instigating confrontations. He, too, was not hesitant in defense of positions which he considered important. Thus, in response to the black American boycott led by Harry Edwards tied to the Mexico City Olympics, Brundage tellingly said, "If the American Negro Athletes boycott the Olympic Games, they won't be missed."²³ This comment energized the well-known protest of Tommie Smith and John Carlos during the medal awards ceremony in 1968. At the same time, Brundage showed instances of forward-thinking leadership as indicated by the delight expressed in his last opening address prior to the 1972 Munich Olympic Games at seeing Islamic women being free to participate in sport.²⁴

It was true that Brundage's life was filled with controversial episodes, and the Olympic Games themselves had a history of racial controversy where some considered the expulsion of South Africa to indicate the end of racism in the Olympic Movement²⁵ while others considered the retirement of Brundage as marking the end of racial thinking.²⁶ In any case, the fact that black athletes from Africa did not enter Olympic competitions until 1952²⁷ could be interpreted as an indicator of the IOC's

ambivalent attitudes towards its policies of concerning race; an attitude that played a part in determining the slow pace of change in the Olympic Movement in this regard.

Nonetheless, while dealing with the 'South African situation',²⁸ Brundage and the IOC were confronted with other challenges. Deciding if the Nationalists in Taiwan or the Communists on mainland China represented the Republic of China became a concern in the early 1950s. How to deal with East and West Germany's participation in the Olympic Games after World War II needed to be addressed throughout the South African situation. The problem of performance enhancement drug use became salient at the 1952 Winter Games at Oslo. Before the 1956 Melbourne Games, the IOC had to deal with the aftermath from the Suez War and Hungarian Revolution. The IOC had to suspend the Indonesian National Olympic Committee in 1963 for denying visas to Israeli and Nationalist China athletes to compete in the IOC sponsored Asian Games. North Korean athletes were suspended for the 1964 Tokyo Games for participating in the discriminatory Games of the New Emerging Forces. Due to the civil rights movement during the 1960s in the USA, the threat of boycott and using the Olympic Games as a political platform lingered. Lastly, leading up to the 1968 Mexico City Games, the IOC had to confront the killing of peaceful protestors by the Mexican army weeks before the Games.²⁹

Beyond world politics, the 1960s had its share of IOC organizational struggles. How to distribute the revenue from Olympic Games' demanded the IOC's attention. This affair changed the dynamic of the organization drastically as NOCs united to create the Permanent General Assembly in 1968 and ISFs founded in 1967 the General

Assembly of the International Federations to negotiate their respective percentages of the revenue.³⁰

Therefore, although the South African situation and racism in sport were important foci for Brundage and the IOC from the mid-1950s to 1970, they were two of many ongoing challenges that Brundage and the IOC had to resolve to maintain the integrity and existence of the Olympic Games.

2. Statement of the Research Issue

Due to pressure from the international climate, the IOC opposed apartheid by suspending South Africa from the 1964 Tokyo and 1968 Mexico City Olympic Games through IOC policy and procedure, which eventually led to South Africa's expulsion from the IOC, Olympic Games, and Olympic Movement in 1970. This dissertation investigated the debates and correspondence of important actors within the IOC and the Olympic Movement, within the context of the organization's discussion of South Africa's controversial place in the Olympic Movement and Olympic Games. Tracing the shifting positions of the IOC and those segments of the Olympic Movement concerned with the South African situation is the aim of this reconstruction. This debate emerged in response to the rise of apartheid policies in South African society and sports, and it was reconstructed here through an archival investigation of the IOC President Avery Brundage's voluminous correspondence on the issue.

The time frame for the investigation was defined by the issue of apartheid in South African Olympic sports first reaching international notoriety in the mid-1950s, to its intermediate conclusion with the retraction of South Africa's invitation the 1968 Mexico City Olympics; these Games were the last that South Africa would have been

eligible to attend prior to its expulsion from the Olympic Movement in May 1970. The focus was provided by the debates, opinions and proclamations carried on by important actors in the IOC in a series of exchanges with influential IOC President Avery Brundage at the centre. The investigation revealed that what I refer to as the 'three dominant voices' shaped the debate, ranging from the IOC and its South African affiliates, to South African domestic resistance, and parts of the international community interested in Olympic sports. As the literature review indicates, such a detailed historical reconstruction of the South African situation between 1955 and 1968 from the perspective of a series of exchanges centering on the leadership of the IOC, in particular Avery Brundage, has not been completed to-date.

Therefore, my research contributes to the body of knowledge in two specific ways. First, it used the archival and historical record to trace and reconstruct specific positions, arguments, interventions, and actions with respect to the issue of South African apartheid in Olympic sports and the Olympic Movement. From this specific contribution, a secondary outcome has resulted: an engagement with the study of race and racism in sports, with a particular focus on the race politics of South African sports in their connection to the Olympic Movement and Olympic Games. Explicit negative racializing remarks are absent from the IOC correspondence investigated here, but it is clear that the IOC's decisions in regard to South Africa's involvement had racializing implications, either contributing to the effects of apartheid on South African sports by operating under the status quo, or by rejecting the effects of apartheid, as was ultimately done through the expulsion of South Africa in 1970.

Before proceeding to a review of the academic literature pertaining to the IOC and South African situation, the historical and cultural background for this study need to be delineated by examining the importance of sport in South African society and the influence exerted on that sport system by the racial politics of the South African regime.

3. The Historical Context of South African Sport and Race Politics

According to George Wright, the popularity of sports in South Africa could be attributed to a variety of reasons, “1) the country has a splendid climate; 2) there is an abundance of open space; and 3) there exists a relative impoverishment of other cultural-aesthetic outlets.”³¹ In addition, sport had been seen as the epitome of social expression and cultural dominance for the white population, thus used as a tool to express the superiority of a more ‘civilized’ white race³² over the black population, which itself adopted sport at the same time as the white population. The origin of the racial tensions that came to characterize sports could be traced back to the days of early colonial expansion, specifically to 1652 when the Dutch East India Company established itself in South Africa.³³ After the Dutch East India Company went bankrupt in 1794, the British occupied the Cape, “British missionaries began to arrive, and as soon as the Cape was definitively annexed, in 1807, attempts were made to stimulate and modernize the economy.”³⁴ During that time, sport became prevalent in South African society with the first ever cricket match played in 1808.³⁵ Although sport interchanges across racial barriers did occur, this did not indicate equality because British rule was generally based on principles of racial discrimination. This was most

clearly expressed through the development of the Constitution of the Union of South Africa in 1910.³⁶

The constitution did not entirely prevent interracial sport and competition from developing between members of the non-white populations, that is, blacks and coloureds.³⁷ However, by the early 1900s, segregation was encouraged because it was believed that segregation itself was the best way to preserve and strengthen existing cultures, which in South Africa meant grouping whites with whites and blacks with blacks. The Natives' Land Act of 1913 limited black ownership of land to 7% of the country, increasing that amount to 13% in 1936.³⁸ In 1923, the Natives (Urban Areas) Act established segregated living areas in cities and the Representation of Natives Act of 1936 further restricted African political rights in the Cape, limiting Africans to voting for only white representatives.³⁹ These initiatives, though introduced by the British, were carried on by the (also white) Dutch-Afrikaner population in a harsher fashion when the British political presence waned. However, non-whites established political representation in 1912 when the South African Native National Congress was founded, which was later renamed the African National Congress in 1923.⁴⁰

During the first half for the 20th century, the black population, more so than the coloured population, had minimal opportunities to participate in sport. The lack of access to resources hindered the development of sport for the non-white four-fifths of the population in general.⁴¹ Thus from 1895 to 1910, it was exclusively white-only organizations that were admitted to international or British Empire organizations. By 1945, not only were firm links established internationally, but some white South African sports leaders had assumed executive positions.⁴² As a founding member of

the International Rugby Board and the International Cricket conference, as well as participation in the Olympic Games since 1908, South Africa succeeded in developing deep roots and allies in the international sporting community.⁴³

The segregation of whites from blacks and coloureds deepened when the Afrikaner National Party came to power in 1948. "Apartheid," an Afrikaans word meaning *apartness*, came to stand for and symbolize the new regime's political direction.⁴⁴ The population was classified according to physical differences and racial heritage. These distinctions ultimately determined the extent of legal and civic rights extended to the individual. They were codified through various laws in the 1940s and 1950s whose oppressive effects were aimed at the black population in particular.⁴⁵ In 1949, the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act was introduced to prevent whites from marrying blacks and coloureds, and a year later, the discouragement of interracial romances was heightened by the Immorality Act, which prohibited sexual acts between whites and any non-whites. Other Acts were passed in 1950 such as the Population Registration Act, which established mechanisms for determining and registering the race of all South Africans. This registration helped to control further segregation of races into specific geographical areas established by the Group Areas Act. The Suppression of Communism Act was also enacted in 1950. This particular Act was harmful to any advocacy for change since communism was defined as "... any scheme that aimed 'at bringing about any political, industrial, social or economic change within the Union by the promotion of disturbance or disorder' or that encouraged 'feelings of hostility between the European and the non-European races of the Union the consequences of which are calculated to further' disorder."⁴⁶ In 1951, Separate

Representation of Voters Act reserved government official positions to white representatives. In 1952, Natives Laws Amendment Act restricted the length of time a person can remain in an urban area without a permit. In 1953, the separation of races became more specific with the Reservation of Separate Amenities Act, which forced each race to have separate amenities that did not need to be equal across races. The Bantu Education Act, also enacted in 1953, removed funding from various non-white schools, and in 1959, the Extension of University Education Act prohibited blacks from attending white institutions of higher education.⁴⁷ Due to the many racist Acts, Robert Archer and Antoine Bouillon noted in their important study of racism in South African sports:

By savagely curtailing black access to education, urban residence, employment, wealth, and the freedom to associate, to travel and to free expression, the Nationalist Government necessarily stunted the natural development of sport and dealt a crippling blow to the attempts of black players to improve their standards of play and organization.⁴⁸

Thus, sports came to be another explicitly politicized area of cultural practice, but it was not until 25 June 1956 that the first official statement regarding sport was made by then Minister of the Interior, Dr. Theophilus Ebenhaezer Dönges.⁴⁹ He denied that the government interfered with non-white sport by pointing out that sport did not fall under government jurisdiction. Most importantly, however, he affirmed that sport should be organized and practiced separately by whites and non-whites, that no interracial competition should occur within the country's borders, and that racial integration on teams should be avoided.⁵⁰ However, well before that official statement, white clubs and associations already practiced segregation.⁵¹ For example,

the South African Athletic Association erected a colour bar in 1931, ensuring that sports would be developed in a segregation perspective.⁵²

In a Bill ostensibly designed to award full independence to tribal reserves in South Africa in 1959, the Prime Minister, Hendrik Verwoerd, ended the possibility for black representation in parliament, a strategy designed to further strip blacks of political power in South Africa.⁵³ Two years later, in 1961, a similarly important announcement came from the Minister of the Interior, Senator Jan De Klerk. On 29 March, he announced that “the government would not approve the participation of mixed teams in global sporting events; that mixed teams from other nations would not be welcome in South Africa; and that only separate white and non-white teams could compete abroad in international competition.”⁵⁴

Some anticipated the possible suspension of South Africa from the Olympic Movement following this policy statement, especially in view of strengthened racial laws when South Africa became a Republic in 1961.⁵⁵ However, at the subsequent IOC Session in Moscow, in 1962, only five members voted for immediate suspension,⁵⁶ allowing South Africa more time to mitigate the effects of apartheid policies on sport. In February 1963, De Klerk outlined four principles of the National Party’s sports policy: each racial group would form a separate controlling association in each sport, white associations would control the code, send representatives to the world federation competitions, and assist the development of black associations. Racially mixed teams would not represent South Africa, and sports officials would not invite racially mixed teams from abroad to play in the Republic.⁵⁷

Amid those repressive developments, then, the impact of the anti-apartheid movement on sport had to be taken into account.⁵⁸ The first challenge to apartheid policies in white South African sports occurred in 1946, when the non-white weightlifters requested recognition from the British Empire Games Weightlifting Federation because the officially recognized South African governing body restricted membership only to white weightlifters.⁵⁹ Likewise, in 1947, the beginnings of an anti-apartheid stance could be noticed when the non-racial South African Table Tennis Board became a recognized affiliate of the International Table Tennis Federation (ITTF). At the same time, ITTF refused to acknowledge the white African Table Tennis Union.⁶⁰ In a similar vein in 1955, Dennis Brutus⁶¹ raised the issue of discrimination in South African sport for the first time in the Olympic Movement.⁶²

Such actions, however, foundered on the IOC's membership policies, since only one specific National Sports Federation (NSF) per country could be represented at the National Olympic Committee (NOC) level and cases of divergence of opinion with the IOC were referred back to the NOC, which in the case of the SANOC was dominated by whites. This created a near unsurmountable obstacle for black athletes.⁶³ In South Africa, whites, therefore, completely controlled access to international selection and competition. Although Avery Brundage advocated as early as 1958 for a form of dual representation from the white and black federations in order to create a national team, his suggestion was never seriously considered by the white federations and SANOC.⁶⁴ Nonetheless, during the 1950s, the black athletic community began to build a voice against apartheid in sport, aided and abetted by other NOCs, NSFs, and International Sports Federations (ISF).

The 1950s were important years for the anti-apartheid movement as many organizations and key relationships began to develop.⁶⁵ An international appeal opposing apartheid was signed by 123 world leaders on 10 December 1957.⁶⁶ The South African Sports Association (SASA), formed in 1958, quickly grew to include over 70,000 black sportsmen and women.⁶⁷ This first non-racial sports organization, originated from a meeting of black sports federations arranged by Brutus, was closed down by police and government representatives.⁶⁸ Brutus himself became the target of an extended harassment campaign.⁶⁹ In May 1959, SASA sent a memorandum to the IOC indicating the failure of SANOC to comply with the *Olympic Charter*.⁷⁰ Also during 1959, the anti-apartheid sport movement received support from Soviet representatives.⁷¹ The IOC was asked by the Soviets to ban South Africa from the Olympic Games on the basis of its apartheid policies⁷² and SANOC's lack of active pursuit of fulfilling the *Olympic Charter* rules for participation, in particular, the stipulations laid down in Articles 1 and 24.⁷³ Article 1 addressed the rejection of participation based on race, religion, or political affiliation. Article 24 enjoined NOCs to enforce all IOC rules and regulations, including Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter*.⁷⁴ Responding to the Soviet initiative, Reginald Honey, the South African IOC representative, gave assurances that all athletes entered by SANOC would be issued passports for competition travel. What Honey omitted to point out was that the likelihood of non-white athletes being entered by the South African Committee was nil.

Brundage's awareness of the political explosiveness of the apartheid issue before the formal request for South Africa's expulsion in 1959 was fortuitous for SANOC.⁷⁵

The question of black athletic opportunity in South Africa was raised by Brundage three years earlier with then SANOC Secretary Ira Emery.⁷⁶ Emery's initial response was not positive and there was evidence in an April 1958 letter to Emery that Brundage tried to make recommendations to be proactive in order to pre-empt the eventual attention this issue would attract on the international stage.⁷⁷ SASA tried to lobby the IOC to put pressure on SANOC to integrate black athletes, but Brundage stood firm in his belief that the IOC should not get involved in member nations' domestic affairs.⁷⁸ All Brundage sought was an affirmation from SANOC that it would do its utmost to abide by the *Olympic Charter*. Although SASA tried to combat the racial discrimination issue by working with the IOC and SANOC, it was difficult for the latter organizations even to acknowledge SASA's concerns.⁷⁹ However, in tune with the initial Soviet backing, support for more open African sport systems also came from fellow Socialist countries such as Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia. In addition, support was registered by western European countries such as Italy, Belgium and France.⁸⁰

The horrific Sharpeville and Langa massacres of March 1960 added to the political urgency of the issue. Sixty-nine people were killed and hundreds wounded when police opened fire on a nonviolent demonstration.⁸¹ Both the African National Congress and Pan-Africanist Congress were banned, as well as new laws that "reinforced official powers of repression: it became legal to detain suspects for up to 90 days without trial or judicial control, subsequently to 180 days (in 1965), then one year, then one year indefinitely renewable."⁸²

This event received international attention and significantly increased the awareness of the apartheid situation in South Africa. SASA subsequently transformed into the South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee (SAN-ROC) in 1962, which integrated the black and coloured organizations in South Africa.⁸³ This coincided with the formation of the African bloc nations into a major anti-apartheid, proactive force against white South Africa.⁸⁴ The development of the African bloc nations began after World War II during the postcolonial era. According to Philip Bell, three crucial events stood out between 1945 and the early 1960s, which changed the African landscape: (1) the Algerian War of 1954-62; (2) the increase of African state representation on the United Nations by 1962; and, (3) the attention garnered by the apartheid conflict in South Africa.⁸⁵

In the area of sport, increased representation in the IOC and participation in the Games in conjunction with support from the Eastern bloc allies gave added power to this growing African bloc. Sport provided an international stage to voice political statements against South Africa. Brundage, because of his understanding of the Olympic Movement as non-political,⁸⁶ was not happy with such statements.

By the 1960s, joining the white establishment in South Africa became a possibility for the black and coloured associations and federations. This courtesy extended by the whites created the appearance of political change, but it did nothing to alter the balance of power between the dominant white minority and the black majority; non-white organizations remained in a subservient role.⁸⁷ As the 1964 Tokyo Olympics approached, the political pressure on SANOC to abide by the *Olympic Charter* increased, especially with regard to Articles 1 and 24.⁸⁸ SANOC ultimately was found

to be in contravention of these principles, and South Africa's invitation to the Tokyo Olympics was withdrawn. African delegates even threatened to walk out of a 1965 NOC Assembly in Rome if South African representative Honey were admitted.⁸⁹

Nonetheless, in an ongoing attempt to establish a balance suitable for the IOC, Brundage continued to welcome new African NOCs into the IOC, even though he feared that the new member nations would use their positions in the Movement to achieve political objectives, especially since sport in 'new' African nations was closely aligned with their respective governments.⁹⁰ Brundage's concerns about the new members' political actions were confirmed through the founding of the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa (SCSA) in 1966. Although its "general purpose was coordination and promotion of sport throughout Africa ... its specific objective was the attack against South African apartheid in sport."⁹¹ SCSA not only wanted ISFs and NSFs to cut ties with South Africa, but also encouraged boycotts of all major competitions attended by South Africa.⁹² In addition, the United Nations (UN), in 1966, deemed apartheid a crime against humanity.⁹³ However, many ISFs maintained the status quo during the 1950s and 1960s. For the exception of the ITTF banning the white table tennis NSF in 1956 and the International Amateur Boxing Association expelling South Africa in 1968, most South African NSFs benefited from international affiliation until 1970 and beyond.⁹⁴

As a proactive measure aimed at securing admittance to the 1968 Olympic Games in Mexico City, SANOC President Frank Braun announced the following concessions:

- (1) South Africa would send a mixed team to the Games, (2) all members would march under the same flag and wear the same colors, (3) South Africans of different racial groups would compete against each other at the Games, and (4) a non-white Olympic

committee would be formed and each racial group would designate its candidates for selection.⁹⁵

Following Braun's statement, Prime Minister Vorster reaffirmed that apartheid would still be enforced domestically. To avoid a backlash, Braun tried to expedite South Africa's acceptance to the Mexico City Olympics. If the IOC did not accept the terms immediately, Braun feared the concessions would be stalled and then reversed upon the South African Olympic team's arrival at the Games. Upon receiving Braun's statement, the African bloc, led by the President of the Ethiopian Olympic Committee, announced a boycott of the Games if South Africa were to be present.⁹⁶ Brundage affirmed that a decision would be made at an upcoming IOC Session, after a commission consisting of Lord Killanin of Ireland, Sir Adetokunbo Ademola of Nigeria, and Reginald Alexander of Kenya had visited South Africa. The commission was given instructions by Brundage not to become involved in political matters.⁹⁷ The commission's report categorically found that South Africa was not in compliance with Olympic principles.⁹⁸ Nonetheless, the Western-dominated IOC still favoured South African participation in the Mexico City Olympic Games. This decision did not sit well with the African bloc, SCSA, and SAN-ROC. A boycott was organized that included fifty countries which threatened to withdraw if South Africa were allowed to participate.⁹⁹ After a brief personal visit to South Africa, Brundage held a meeting to vote on a retraction of the invitation to South Africa. In a vote on 21 April 1968, the IOC supported retraction by a 47 to 16 vote.¹⁰⁰ In an attempt to avoid the overt politicization of the issue, the IOC rationalized its decision out of a concern for safety issues, rather than on the basis of a violation of the Olympic Movement's principles.¹⁰¹ Brutus, however, offered insight into SANOC's actual political strategies:

Frequently it is said that South Africa had undertaken to send, for the first time, a truly representative team which would include non-whites. This is not the whole truth. There are documents to show that the offer made by the [South African National Olympic Committee] was in fact a conditional one, that only those non-whites who were prepared to accept apartheid in sport would be considered for selection. It was this condition that caused the majority of the non-white sportsmen to reject the offer and it was the knowledge of this that enabled General Clark, President of the Mexican Olympic Committee, to decline to follow the IOC's order to issue South Africa an invitation.¹⁰²

Subsequent to the exclusion of South Africa from the 1968 Games, the United Nations (UN) also placed the issue of South African apartheid and sport on its agenda. The UN General Assembly passed its first resolution on 2 December 1968, and subsequent resolutions were extensions of this initial resolution.¹⁰³ Although non-binding, the UN resolutions enhanced the legitimacy of the anti-apartheid movement and provided an added rationale for those who protested against South Africa.¹⁰⁴ The increasing international pressure led to the expulsion of South Africa from the Olympic Movement in Amsterdam in May 1970, with a vote of 35 to 28, and 3 abstentions.¹⁰⁵ Led by SCSA's secretary-general Jean-Claude Ganga (Congo) and President Abraham Ordia (Nigeria), SCSA was an influential voice when the IOC made the decision to terminate South Africa's membership.¹⁰⁶

The expulsion of South Africa from the Olympic Movement registered both supporters as well as opponents. On one side, there were the traditional conservative Western IOC members and Avery Brundage, who gave South Africa the benefit of the doubt on the issue. On the other side was the alliance of Communist states and Third World countries who vowed to eliminate South Africa from the IOC. The position of the Communist and Third World alliance continued to strengthen as more nations

were admitted to the Olympic organization, which, as much as he welcomed them, caused Brundage concerns since he feared the increasing politicization of the movement.¹⁰⁷ Brundage, fearing intrusion of domestic politics, or, for that matter any kind of politics, was reluctant to trust the motivations behind any new committees and groups that formed in support or non-support of the current South African sport system.

In an attempt to offer an illusion of change after expulsion from the IOC, South Africa undertook a rebranding strategy to mask as 'multi-national' the racializing tendencies of apartheid. The 1971 multi-national sports policy had three goals:

(1) to break up the unified sports federations and create separate Indian, Coloured and African associations; (2) to create new racial federations where it proves impossible to provoke a division; (3) to finance and promote the emergence of a new sporting elite among Blacks whose sporting and political interests will lead them to support the status quo and the official policies of the regime, while effectively depriving the non-racial sports associations of finance and facilities.¹⁰⁸

However, sporting organizations were not misled by South Africa's attempted rebranding of the sport system as multi-racial sport. Only when total isolation from international sport seemed to be a threat, did sports administrators attempt to introduce modifications that accommodated non-white participants.¹⁰⁹

South Africa, then, had a well-entrenched history of sport, racism, and segregation. The IOC and the Olympic Movement played a role in contributing to, and opposing, racism and segregation in sport within South Africa. During the pivotal period when South Africa's relationship with the IOC and the Olympic Movement changed from active membership to excommunication, Avery Brundage was the IOC President. In addition to addressing the racist politics of South Africa and the internal and external

pressures placed on the IOC, Brundage also had to take into account the IOC's past encounters with racism and his own personal accusations of being anti-black and anti-Semitic.

The following section examines literature pertaining to Brundage's character and the state of racism in South African sport to provide some human and cultural context. In addition, the literature that discussed Brundage's private correspondence with sport and government officials regarding the South African issue was examined to provide an idea of Brundage's firsthand thoughts on South Africa's standing within the IOC.

4. Literature Review

4.1 Racism and the Olympics

The Olympic Games, as the relevant literature indicated, have experienced its share of controversy with regard to the issue of racism and politics of race. A telling example occurred as early as the 1904 Games. Matti Gøksyr showed that the 1904 Anthropology Days accompanying the Olympic Games consisted of evaluating various African, Asian and American Indian representatives on their physical capabilities in comparison to "sport's dominated cultural group at the time: the white man."¹¹⁰ Although the racializing thrust of this exhibit originated with the organizers of the Fair, and not with the Olympic organizers, the author pointed out the latter did not attempt to end or at least reframe the focus of the Anthropology Days.

The issue of racism came to the fore again during the 1936 Berlin Olympic Games, which Adolph Hitler and Nazi leaders avidly supported to display the superiority of

the Aryan race and Fascist political ideology.¹¹¹ The discrimination towards Jews and other ‘undesirable’ minorities was widely known,¹¹² but these circumstances were not sufficient to dissuade the Olympic Games’ organizers to change the host destination. To alleviate suspicions the Americans had regarding the charges of discrimination against Jews and others in Germany, Brundage, as the President of the American Olympic Committee, conducted an investigation in 1934. In addition to being impressed by Germany’s sense of order, Brundage interviewed Jewish leaders who assured him that there would be no discrimination.¹¹³ Therefore, upon his return, “The American Olympic Committee, which met with Brundage and voted to accept Germany’s invitation to participate in the Games, claimed that sport was the wedge that would lead to the end of discrimination in Germany.”¹¹⁴ Although Brundage garnered much criticism for his pro-German stance and anti-Semitic tendencies,¹¹⁵ his support for Olympism and action as the catalyst that brought the American team to the Berlin Games won him a seat on the IOC.¹¹⁶

Carrying the same attitude from the Berlin Games—the Olympics enabling contests between individuals, not nations¹¹⁷—Brundage was supportive of South Africa’s ongoing inclusion in the IOC and participation in the Olympic Games. As Ramsamy mentioned, Brundage considered apartheid a domestic political issue whereby the IOC had no jurisdiction over the government’s actions and, therefore, could not sanction SANOC.¹¹⁸ Even after South Africa’s expulsion from the IOC and after Brundage’s retirement as President in 1972, he believed South Africa should be re-admitted into the Olympic Movement.¹¹⁹ The interesting query remained: was Brundage’s justification of South Africa’s position sound and consistent throughout

the years, especially when he made bold statements regarding the violation of the *Olympic Charter*:

If and when a Government determines to take over its national Olympic Committee there is, of course, very little effective opposition that can be offered by the national amateur sports organizations. The only correction for situation of this kind when the letter and spirit of the Olympic rules are not followed is for the rest of the world to refuse to play with countries which are in violation of Olympic principles.¹²⁰

There was abundant literature referring to Brundage's politics and the impact he had as IOC President during the South African issue.¹²¹ However, the literature detailing the correspondence between Brundage and officials from the IOC, NOCs, ISFs, South African government, or other sport organizations was rare. To my knowledge, only a few important studies concentrating on the correspondence between Brundage and officials existed. Nonetheless, three areas of literature in regard to Brundage and the South African issue need to be discussed: (1) Avery Brundage's life and work in the Olympic Movement; (2) sport, racism, and South Africa; and, (3) studies concentrating on the correspondence between Brundage and officials.

4.2 Avery Brundage's Life and Work in the Olympic Movement

In a previous section, *Avery Brundage and the IOC's Position on Race and Sport*, an account was provided outlining Brundage's life and involvement in the IOC. However, even though I, and many others,¹²² have profiled Brundage, it is worth briefly highlighting three authors who have examined the life of Avery Brundage.

In an extremely flattering book, Heinz Schöbel (East Germany's [DDR] first IOC member) explored the four dimensions of Brundage: sportsman, sports leader, construction engineer, and art lover and collector.¹²³ Schöbel chronicled Brundage's young life as a good student and athlete devoted to both pursuits equally. After his career as an athlete, peaking as the United States all-round champion in athletics, Brundage began participating in the administrative side of sport. His work in the United States garnered much attention at the international level, where he became Vice President of the IOC in 1945 and President in 1952. Being aligned with Coubertin's ideals for the Olympic Movement, he seemed to be the perfect fit for the job of IOC President. Schöbel painted Brundage as a President who fostered international growth of the IOC and development of domestic NOCs, while his ideals were anchored in fair play, sportsmanship, and amateurism. Published in 1968 while Brundage was still IOC President, Schöbel's work was a favourable, positive interpretation of Brundage's presence on the international sports scene, best categorized as hagiography.

A biographical work about Brundage completed by Allen Guttman in 1984 is the seminal reference on issues related to Brundage.¹²⁴ The detail and breadth of Guttman's work advances far beyond Schöbel's effort. Guttman chronicled Brundage's every step, from his humble beginning in Detroit to his death in a German hospital on 8 May 1975. Guttman seemingly constructed the Brundage narrative from an objective viewpoint, highlighting both negative and positive aspects of Brundage's life. Some of Brundage's more controversial moments included the inclusion of the Soviet Union in the Olympic Movement and trying to keep South Africa

and Rhodesia involved as well. Furthermore, a chapter was dedicated to the Nazi Olympics, which discussed Brundage's controversial support of Germany and, as a result, being labeled as an anti-Semite.¹²⁵ Guttmann also included a large section on the South African issue, which detailed Brundage's struggle to keep South Africa in the Olympic Movement. His efforts became so strong, he eventually was labeled as anti-black, as well.

These two immediate examples of Brundage maintaining his firm stance of keeping politics and the Olympic Games separate can be seen as one of Brundage's positive characteristics. For the most part, although one might not favour Brundage's stances, he was consistent even during stressful, controversial situations. Not only did he have strong views on the separation of politics and the Olympic Games, he also supported amateurism and non-commercialism in the Games. Above all, Brundage considered the Olympic Movement as a 'secular religion' which all affiliated with the IOC had to support. When in power, Brundage's perception of Coubertin's ideals led the decision-making of the IOC and he made sure he was surrounded by those who shared the same perception of Olympism. It was not until his last term as President that he lost control of the IOC.

There was only one other person who could possibly offer a more concise biography of Avery Brundage. Maynard Brichford was the leader of the team responsible for processing the Avery Brundage Collection (ABC) in 1975 at the University of Illinois.¹²⁶ Brichford did not write a complete Brundage biography, but he has written a variety of articles based on ABC materials. Brichford considered eight aspects of Brundage's life – student, engineer, financier, athlete, sports official,

ideologue, public symbol, and collector.¹²⁷ Although Brichford did discuss each in his publications, two aspects specific to Brichford's work garnered particular attention: Brundage's 'internationalization' of the Olympic Games,¹²⁸ and his stance on racism.¹²⁹

Brundage's contribution to the international growth of the Olympic Movement was rarely celebrated in the literature. Brichford mentioned, "In 1960 alone, seventeen new nations emerged in Africa. Brundage presided over the first Olympic Games in Australia, Asia and Latin America, played a major role in establishing the Pan-American Games, and attended the first African Games."¹³⁰ Even though Brundage was severely criticized for this focus on internationalism, he continued to include countries in the Olympic Movement regardless of domestic and international politics. Unfortunately, Brundage's perceived negative actions drew attention away from the much more positive actions which benefited the Olympic Movement. One recurring controversial theme was how Brundage dealt with racism. The *Olympic Charter* clearly stated that racism was not to be tolerated within the Olympic Movement. However, for Brundage, this ideal clearly clashed with the ideal of a non-political Olympic Movement environment. Unfortunately, Brundage seemed to focus more on making sure the Olympic Games remained non-political, which clouded his judgement when evaluating domestic racism as a violation of the *Olympic Charter*.

The biographical literature on Brundage helped identify what type of characteristics made up his personality and how those characteristics could have affected his decisions and proclamations when acting as the IOC President. How he dealt with the South African issue is the focus of this study. So, too, was how he reacted

to challenges relative to consideration of the state of sport and racism in South Africa during his tenure as IOC President.

4.3 Sport, Racism, and South Africa

Considering the importance of the South African apartheid issue, the range of articles and books discussing this topic was extensive. This section highlights some of the notable publications strictly pertaining to sport, racism, and South Africa. One of the earliest inclusive books on sport and race in South Africa was written by Mary Draper in 1963.¹³¹ It provided a detailed account of the then current laws and government policies affecting multi-racial sport and reminds the reader only actual law can be enforced, regardless of the government policies supported by the Nationalist Party. Draper discussed the *Olympic Charter*, the associated South African sporting bodies such as SANOC, SASA, and SAN-ROC, the stance of the IOC, South African Olympic and government representatives, and the general status of South Africa in the Olympic Movement. Of course, how the South African issue was discussed and detailed depended on the author's viewpoint and information available to the author at the time.

In 1970, when South Africa was expelled from the Olympic Movement, more valuable publications surfaced discussing the South African issue. Morgan Naidoo voiced his concern with the black sport situation in South Africa.¹³² The black community was interested in increasing involvement at every level in sport, but he was convinced whites were not interested in the welfare of black sport. Naidoo cites Braun, who was then President of SANOC, as one administrator who attempted to incorporate the black community. However, Naidoo believed it was just an attempt to

appease the IOC rather than having the welfare of black sport at heart. Taking a more optimistic view, Richard Lapchick argued that the issue of racism and the Olympic Movement had come to an end in 1970 after the long struggle which resulted in South Africa's expulsion.¹³³

Dennis Brutus' hardships, endured on behalf of the non-white South African sport movement, are well-documented in the literature.¹³⁴ Brutus provided a close, personal perspective shaped by his in-depth involvement as a leader in the anti-apartheid movement from the 1950s.¹³⁵ Another detailed contribution about the South African issue came from Chris de Broglio.¹³⁶ His booklet was an updated version of Draper's 1963 book, which included additional details about the government's continued attempt to appease the IOC while maintaining the apartheid stance in terms of other domestic and international matters. De Broglio's insight was unique because it was informed by his athletic experiences as a competitive weightlifter and representative of South African weightlifting from 1949 to the early 1960s. He later joined forces with Brutus to form SAN-ROC and, as a result, was forced to leave South Africa, ultimately settling in England.

The year following South Africa's expulsion from the Olympic Movement, Peter Hain released a book documenting the Stop the Seventy Tour (STST) campaign,¹³⁷ which successfully forced South Africa from participating in most international rugby and cricket competition. Hain provided a concise historical background of South Africa and apartheid, and included South Africa's struggle in the Olympic Movement to contextualize STST.¹³⁸ In addition to discussing STST and providing multiple useful summaries, Joan Brickhill¹³⁹ added something new by commenting on the South

African government's attempt to rebrand apartheid sport as 'multi-national' sport in 1971. As Brickhill notes, "multi-national sport entails competition (a) between the four main racial groups, each group being treated as a separate nation, and (b) between international teams and the four main racial groups."¹⁴⁰ The perception of multi-racial competition was just a ruse by the government to keep racial groups still segregated while maintaining the white status quo.

Reflecting back on the campaign to isolate South Africa from international sport and its effect on the whole state of apartheid in South Africa, March Krotee and Luther Schwick¹⁴¹ and Krotee¹⁴² used personal observation, personal correspondence with South African sport officials, and secondary sources to examine the social and historical aspects to try to identify the external pressures which affected internal change. One such external factor was the involvement of the UN. Maxine Hunter focused strictly on the UN and its role in the anti-apartheid movement.¹⁴³ After providing a summary leading up to the first UN resolution in 1968 that outlined sanctions against South Africa specifically pertaining to sport, multiple resolutions are highlighted in the study. Although the UN resolutions and declarations can be used to legitimize the protest or exclusion of South Africa from sporting activities, Hunter reminded the reader that UN resolutions and declarations were not lawfully binding, but only carried as much importance as countries attached to it.

In 1982, Sam Ramsamy¹⁴⁴ and Robert Archer and Antoine Bouillon¹⁴⁵ added to the breadth of literature on South Africa, sport, and racism. Ramsamy's work capitalized on many documents from the 1970s and 80s not previously provided in other publications. In addition to being a concise reference manual, Ramsamy included a

small chapter highlighting the role of sponsorship in apartheid and sport, which had not been done before. Archer and Bouillon provided a complete account of sport and racism in South Africa from the beginning of European explorers landing on South African soil on 5 April 1652 to the 1981 Springbok tour of New Zealand. Although sport was the focus, Archer and Bouillon also discussed in detail the socioeconomics, education, and politics in South Africa. A more recent version of Archer and Bouillon can be found in Douglas Booth's account of sport and politics in South Africa. Published in 1998, Booth's study brought the perspective of a new South Africa after the resolution of apartheid and a democratic election placing Nelson Mandela as its new leader.¹⁴⁶

Although the aforementioned literature on sport, racism, and South Africa was an integral part to frame the South African issue, it was the literature focusing on the correspondence between Brundage and officials which was of utmost importance to this dissertation.

4.4 Correspondence between Brundage and Officials

Focusing strictly on the rise of the African bloc in opposition to the IOC during the South African race issue, Shane Quick suggested a shift in power away from Brundage and the IOC to African and Third World representation.¹⁴⁷ As Brundage expressed continually throughout his tenure on the IOC, politics had no place in the Olympic Movement, while, conversely, the African nations deemed sport, especially the Olympic Games, as an ideal venue to gain leverage and use the power of politics to make statements on an international stage about issues outside sport. Nonetheless,

the African nation-states' increase of power, in part, was made possible by Eastern bloc support.

At a meeting between the IOC and NOCs in 1959, dialogue ensued between Brundage, the Soviets, and South African representatives about apartheid and sport.¹⁴⁸ Brundage was well aware of the pressure arising from apartheid in South Africa because the IOC had received letters of concern before 1959. In letters to SANOC officials, Brundage suggested a proactive approach to prevent potential political fallout.¹⁴⁹ The IOC continued to support SANOC's involvement with the Olympic Movement because of its firm stance of separating politics from the Olympic Games. Only after a vote to eliminate South Africa from the IOC was proposed and defeated in 1962, did Brundage issue a formal warning to South Africa to abide by the *Olympic Charter* by October 1963 in order to avoid suspension from the 1964 Olympic Games.¹⁵⁰ South Africa's invitation to the 1964 Tokyo Games was withdrawn as a result of SANOC's non-compliance with the conditions contained in Brundage's official warning. Quick pointed out that at the meeting where the invitation was withdrawn, the African bloc's power was extended as NOCs of four African countries were granted full recognition by the IOC.¹⁵¹ Brundage continued to pursue communication between SANOC and the IOC in order to keep South Africa involved in the Olympic Movement. The report of a commission to assess South African sport indicated that SANOC was still not meeting the minimum standards for participation in the Olympic Movement. The majority of IOC members ignored this when voting to allow South Africa to participate, based on the fact that SANOC ostensibly was doing as well as could be expected under the political conditions existent in South Africa. This IOC decision

triggered the threat of a wide-spread boycott of the 1968 Mexico City Olympics. As a result, the invitation to South Africa was withdrawn once again and South Africa was eventually expelled from the IOC and Olympic Movement in 1970.

Quick's study clearly displayed the influence that the African bloc had on the expulsion of South Africa from the Olympic Movement. Quick focused on the voices of Brundage and South African officials to provide indication of the pressures on the IOC and SANOC which led to the expulsion of South Africa from the IOC. Quick attributed Brundage's loss of power to the rise of power in the African bloc. Quick's examination was helpful because the pressure from African nations was certainly one factor playing a part in the expulsion of South African involvement in the Olympic Movement.

Donald Macintosh, Hart Cantelon, and Lisa McDermott discussed how the IOC, under Brundage's leadership, acted as a transnational organization when dealing with South Africa in the Olympic Movement during the 1950s and 1960s.¹⁵² The IOC's mission was to spread Olympism through NOCs without exhibiting much interest in the political ideology expressed by IOC members and hosting countries; thus, the IOC's decisions were driven by the commitment to Olympism.¹⁵³ Therefore, to have SANOC abide by the *Olympic Charter* was the IOC's main interest. To provide evidence of the IOC's attempt to keep the focus on the values of Olympism and the organizational procedures of the IOC, and away from the subject of apartheid in South Africa, ABC was used to highlight the correspondence between SANOC and the IOC officials. Letters between Brundage and SANOC officials discussing strategies to help South Africa comply with IOC rules appeared as early as the late 1950s. Macintosh,

Cantelon, and McDermott suggested that the ideals of Olympism were the main thrust for decision making within the transnational structure of the IOC, not Brundage himself. Brundage represented a brand of Olympism that enforced the non-political nature of the IOC, which ignored the internal policies of South African government, and, in turn, influenced the continual inclusion of South Africa in the IOC. Although the Olympic Movement was the most important factor directing the IOC, the conflict and struggle amongst IOC members regarding apartheid was created by how Olympism should be pursued by the IOC. By the time South Africa's exclusion became a reality, the ideals of Olympism Brundage once enforced became extinct because of the gravity of the apartheid issue. Brundage felt strongly about his version of Olympism because of the charismatic legacy left by the founder of the modern Olympic Games, Pierre de Coubertin.

Cantelon and McDermott made a connection between the decision-making of the IOC and the "charismatic legacy" of Coubertin.¹⁵⁴ Indicative of this connection was the correspondence between Brundage and the South African representative to the IOC, Reginald Honey. It showed how Coubertin's idealist vision of Olympism was ingrained in the IOC organization. In turn, that devotion to Olympism drove the decisions of the IOC on important matters such as dealing with the South African apartheid issue. Brundage expressed Coubertin's Olympic ideals in his letters to IOC members, such as freedom from domestic and international political pressure. As South Africa's representative on the IOC from 1948 until his death in 1982, Honey was an influential advocate of Brundage's concept of Olympism.¹⁵⁵ As an ideal IOC member who dedicated and volunteered much of his time to sport, Honey played an important role

in the South African situation and was devoted to Olympic ideals. Honey faced extreme pressure during the years leading to South Africa's expulsion from the Olympic Movement in 1970. Although he had to defend South Africa's racial policies, he was favoured enough to be asked to remain on the IOC after South Africa was expelled.¹⁵⁶ According to the authors, Honey and Brundage shared not only the same devotion to the Olympic Movement, but similarities characterizing the membership of the IOC during the 1950s and 1960s: white, male, well-educated, and privileged. All these similarities between Honey, Brundage, and other IOC members added to the IOC's cohesive strength in continuing the charismatic ideals of Coubertin. Further, and more importantly, Brundage trusted the support from those who shared these characteristics. It was only when opposition arose to Brundage's and Honey's version of Olympism that problems ensued with South Africa's membership in the IOC. Cantelon and McDermott suggest that the correspondence between Brundage and Honey slightly favoured the white regime,¹⁵⁷ not because Brundage and Honey were racists, but because they sought to uphold Coubertin's vision of Olympism. There was a sense of entitlement given to SANOC to control all-things Olympic within South Africa because of its history with the IOC and commitment to the Olympic Movement since 1908.¹⁵⁸ Cantelon and McDermott's study was valuable because it provided insight into how those of Brundage's and Honey's persuasion made decisions within the IOC, and because it identified Honey as one source of input Brundage had on South Africa's status. Despite Honey's history as a representative of South Africa on the IOC, by the mid-1960s, he became more of a diplomatic figure.

Honey, however, was not the only IOC member Brundage confided in with regard to South African politics and sport. Identifying a different IOC member, Maureen Smith focused on Reginald Alexander's correspondence with the IOC regarding the status of South Africa in the Olympic Movement. Alexander's written exchanges span more than 25 years and involve three IOC Presidents, one of whom was Brundage, who considered Alexander an ally and trusted confidante.¹⁵⁹ Elected in 1960, Alexander represented Kenya on the IOC. He and Brundage shared the same sentiment about domestic politics not infringing on participation in the Olympic Games. Therefore, not only should South African politics not prevent athletes from participating in the Games, it was, in fact, the athletes who were experiencing discrimination based on a violation of the *Olympic Charter*.¹⁶⁰ In his letters, Brundage shared his optimism with Alexander about finding the right solution to help the non-white sportsmen in South Africa. Brundage held Alexander in such high regard, he selected Alexander as part of the three man fact-finding commission to investigate South African sport before making a decision on South Africa's status for the 1968 Mexico City Games.¹⁶¹ Although Brundage was one IOC President discussed in Smith's study, her primary focus was Alexander's contribution to the South African issue, not the three IOC Presidents with whom Alexander communicated. Alexander's correspondence with Brundage was valuable in providing a better picture of Brundage's perception of the South African issue, but it was only one piece of the puzzle.

These articles focussed on partial aspects of the topic proposed for this study, and as such are of value in the framing of the research issue. They do not, however,

represent the theme in its completeness, neither in the selection of its time period, nor in the focus of its questioning. The much more detailed investigation of the historical and archival record carried out in this study acknowledges this literature, but provides a more detailed as well as more in-depth investigation of the issue.

5. Methodology and Methods

Historiography attempts to recreate historical events of a past accessible only through the stories and narratives produced about them. In an important study on the work and methods of sport historians, Douglas Booth analyzes three models of the creation of narrative and historical inquiry in sport history: reconstructionism, constructionism, and deconstructionism.¹⁶² First, Booth argues, reconstructionists seek to reveal history through the interrogation and contextualization of historical facts taken as direct empirical evidence; it is the facts that ‘tell the story’ as much as the historian who produces it. Reconstructionists thus uphold that “history exists independently of the historian and that discovering the past is an objective process, uncontaminated by ideology.”¹⁶³ Reconstructionists transform historical data, conceived as ‘objective facts’, into a narrative that most closely approximates the historical process as, in the understanding of the historian, it objectively happened.

Secondly, constructionists, in a stance critical towards reconstructionism, argue that it is impossible to shape empirical historical facts into historical narrative from a completely objective perspective, and insist on the importance of theory in the production of narrative. In this view:

...theory is fundamental in history for at least three reasons. ... It provides frameworks and principles for selecting evidence and thus steers practitioners away from contradictions in their explanations.

Second, theory brings to the fore interrelations between the components of human experiences at given times and in so doing enriches historical accounts. Third,... identifying historical patterns invariably involves some form of abstract thinking and connections to theoretical explanation and interpretations.¹⁶⁴

That is to say, the historical narrative does not simply emerge through the historical data, but the treatment of the data itself is shaped by the perspectives and concepts provided through the specific theoretical lens used.

Deconstructionists, thirdly, move away from an insistence on the preeminence of the data as shaping the historical narrative. They focus on the problems of creating historical narrative itself, and on the importance of language in the creative process. They acknowledge the possibility of multiple perspectives and reject the possibility that a single interpretation only can be applied to the data in a given case.¹⁶⁵

Booth's model of sport historiography is helpful since it allows me to locate my own approach to the topic of this study. I adopt a reconstructionist approach since my aim is to trace and reconstruct the IOC's treatment of the South African situation, through investigating specifically the correspondence of key actors, connected through a series of exchanges that centre on Avery Brundage and trace his correspondence with other actors playing important roles in this issue, and also tracing the interaction between these actors. Through this reconstruction, I unravel the perspectives and strategies of the actors that become evident in the voluminous correspondence developed on the issue. Conducting the analysis from the reconstructionist stance allowed me to identify and trace 'three dominant voices' in this debate that became influential as the debate unfolded in the correspondence; the thesis was structured to provide a perspective on the three dominant voices. This in-

depth investigation of these central and influential actors contributes a new dimension to our understanding of the IOC's approach to the South African situation, and the events leading to South Africa's expulsion.

Since this study's research problem necessarily makes reference to issues of race and racial discrimination, my conceptual approach to these phenomena requires a brief explanation. Although the correspondence from Brundage and the IOC did not contain explicitly racist remarks, decisions made by the IOC in the context of the South African apartheid regime, had racializing implications, either challenging the effects of apartheid or confirming the status quo. The implicit racializing effects created by such decisions cannot be understood as expressions of racist postures adopted by Brundage or the IOC; neither can the implicit racializing effects be ignored. Paraschak and Tyrone, among other writers, have referred to such implicit or consequential racializing effects as "structural racism."¹⁶⁶ Such racism was not the result of explicitly expressed racializing positions or actions, but it emerged from the structural properties of the social system of South Africa within which people and organizations, the IOC among them, acted to effect certain outcomes in the area of Olympic sports in disregard of racially discriminatory consequences resulting from their actions.¹⁶⁷ The racializing effects of the IOC's, Avery Brundage's, or the other relevant actors' perspectives and strategies expressed in their correspondence during their involvement in the South African issue, merit extensive consideration in a separate study.

The method for the empirical research for this study makes extensive use of archival sources. The IOC's organizational structure defined the important positions

that had a bearing on the evolution of the South African situation, notably the position of President Brundage. In order to clarify why and how decisions were made by the IOC in regard to SANOC, a narrative was developed using the correspondence, dialogue, commentary, press examinations, and position statements from IOC and NOC officials, SANOC, South Africa's domestic resistance representatives, and the international community. Early in the research process, three dominant voices emerged in dialogue with the IOC: (1) South African Olympic affiliates; (2) domestic resistance, and (3) international community. Therefore, the source materials were placed in one of the three categories to construct the narrative. The South African Olympic affiliates were any individuals and groups already associated with the white South African sport structure and culture. Domestic resistant forces represented any individuals and groups within South Africa that were fighting for non-white equality and equity in South African sport. Finally, the international community represented any individuals and groups from outside South Africa that were not associated with any South African Olympic affiliates or domestic resistant forces, and argued in support of, or against, South Africa's participation in the IOC, Olympic Games, and Olympic Movement.

6. Limitations and Delimitations

It is possible that important documents on the South African situation have been placed in archives in South Africa. Should such documents exist, they may possibly have been written in Afrikaans, the dominant language of political exchange in the country at the time. Both those possibilities place a limitation on the scope of sources accessible to me for the completion of this study: I do not speak Afrikaans, and it was

logistically impossible for me to visit archives in South Africa that might have such documents in their holdings. Such documents thus were not utilized for this study. The study was limited to documents written in English.

A delimitation on the scope of the archival sources to be investigated for this project emerged from the way I defined my main topic and perspective. Investigating the IOC's viewpoint on the South African situation from the perspective of its most influential administrator at the time, IOC President Avery Brundage and his numerous correspondents on this issue, allowed me to concentrate my research effort on Brundage's voluminous correspondence and related documents. This collection in its entirety is housed at the University of Illinois. In the 1970s, the German Bundesinstitut für Sportwissenschaften in Cologne arranged to have the entire collection microfilmed.¹⁶⁸ A copy of these microfilms was acquired by the International Centre for Olympic Studies at Western University in London, Ontario. Western University's copy of the Avery Brundage Collection emerged as one of two main archival sources of information used in this study; the second primary source was the Wolf Lyberg translations and summaries of the IOC Executive Committee Minutes and IOC General Session Minutes, also housed at the International Center for Olympic Studies.¹⁶⁹

The time line of this dissertation is delimited to the years 1955 to 1968. The year 1955 was selected as the starting point because debates on the issue of racial discrimination in South Africa relative to the Olympic Movement first emerged at that time. The end date was defined by the IOC's withdrawal of the invitation to South Africa for the 1968 Mexico City Olympic Games; these were the last Olympic Games

South Africa was eligible for prior to its expulsion from the Olympic Movement in May 1970. South Africa never recovered from the controversy of the 1968 Grenoble vote, and the opposition had enough supporters in the IOC to ostracize South Africa until racial discrimination was satisfactorily reduced from South African sport.

Since this study focusses on the thinking of the 'three dominant voices' on the issue, and since, therefore, their correspondence necessarily was the primary focus, newspaper material was included only to the extent that newspaper clippings were summarized in items of correspondence, and thus contributed to express the thinking of the primary players. The undoubtedly voluminous newspaper reporting on the issue thus lay outside the specific research focus of my study. It would require a separate study to carry out a content analysis of the newspaper reporting.

7. Chapter Overview

In the main chapters of this study, the correspondence between the IOC and other officials was retraced to understand the interplay between the IOC, the developing political situation in South Africa, and the influence of extraneous social circumstances, during three crucial phases of this development, within the relevant time line for this study.

Chapter 2 covers the years 1955 to 1960, the time when the issue of South African racial discrimination and its significance for South African sports and the Olympic Movement first rose onto the agenda. It traces the beginnings of a divergence of opinions between the IOC and South African sport and government officials. Inquiries into apartheid were made by Avery Brundage and other IOC officials, internal and external pressure on the IOC began to mount, the Afrikaner Nationalist Party started

to establish official sport policies, and non-white resistant forces became better organized within South Africa. During this time period, the IOC thus had to renegotiate with SANOC concerning its status in the Olympic Games and the Olympic Movement. Furthermore, the IOC's debates on this issue were influenced by the questions and accusations against SANOC from domestic resistance and the international community.

Chapter 3 covers the years 1960 to 1964, which saw the growing strength of domestic, non-white resistance and the IOC's first confrontation with SANOC, resulting in an official warning by Brundage to SANOC to comply with the *Olympic Charter*, in order to be included in the 1964 Tokyo Olympic Games. Surprisingly, after being replaced in 1961, former SANOC Secretary General Ira Emery emerged as a valuable though unofficial source of information about the internal status of South African sport and South African governmental laws and policies. Since SANOC did not comply with the terms of the IOC's Baden-Baden resolution, the 1964 Tokyo Olympic Games marked the first time the IOC withdrew its invitation to South Africa.

Chapter 4 examines the explosion of an international presence supporting the anti-apartheid movement from 1964 to 1968. To help negotiate South Africa's involvement in the IOC, Olympic Movement, and Olympic Games, Brundage organized a Commission to assess South African sport. The South Africa Commission report in conjunction with SANOC's assurance of entering a mixed race team resulted in an absolute majority vote to include South Africa in the 1968 Mexico City Olympic Games, which caused the anti-apartheid movement to become stronger. With the threat of a significant boycott looming, political aspects began to dominate the IOC's decision-

making process, resulting in the withdrawal of the IOC's invitation to South Africa to participate in the 1968 Mexico City Games.

Chapter 5 offers the conclusions that emerge from this study. It will reflect on the changing relationships between the IOC and the South African sport community, in particular SANOC, and the ways in which this found expression in the thinking and reasoning of the 'three dominant voices,' as it emerged during the time period under consideration.

Endnotes for Chapter One

- ¹ Maynard Brichford, "Avery Brundage and the Internationalization of the Olympic Games," in *Olympic Perspective: Third International Symposium for Olympic Research*, eds. Robert K. Barney et al. (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1996), 140.
- ² Ibid, 141.
- ³ Allen Guttman, *The Games Must Go On: Avery Brundage and the Olympic Movement* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984), 2.
- ⁴ Ibid, 23.
- ⁵ John Lucas, "A String of Pearls: Avery Brundage Discourses 1929-1972," in *The History, the Evolution and Diffusion of Sports and Games in Different Cultures: Proceeding of the 4th International HISPA Seminar*, Leuven, Belgium, April 1-5, 1975, Dept. Lichamelijke Opvoeding, K. U. Leuven, eds. Roland Renson, Pierre Paul de Nayer, and Michel Ostyn (Brussel: B.L.O.S.O., Bestuur voor de Lichamelijke Opvoeding, de Sport en het Openluchtlevens, 1976), 289-290.
- ⁶ Maynard Brichford, "Avery Brundage – the Man and the Collection," in *Sport History: Olympic Scientific Congress, July 19-26, 1984 University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon*, eds. Norbert Müller and Joachim K. Rühl (Niedernhausen: Schors-Verlag, 1985), 247.
- ⁷ Hart Cantelon and Lisa McDermott, "Charisma and the Rational-Legal Organization: A Case Study of the Avery Brundage – Reginald Honey Correspondence Leading Up to the South African Expulsion From the International Olympic Movement," *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies* 10 (2001): 34.
- ⁸ Guttman, *The Games Must Go On*, 157.
- ⁹ While South African apartheid is race discrimination, politics also played a significant role in the South African landscape. This combination of race and politics did not bode well for South Africa's inclusion in the IOC and participation in the Olympic Games.
- ¹⁰ Avery Brundage, "The Olympic Movement: Objectives and Achievements," *Gymnasion* 3, no. 1 (1966): 4.
- ¹¹ Lucas, "A String of Pearls," 295.
- ¹² Cantelon and McDermott, "Charisma Organization," 40.
- ¹³ "Olympism in Action," International Olympic Committee, accessed September 16, 2014, <http://www.olympic.org/olympism-in-action>.
- ¹⁴ Brundage, "Olympic Movement," 4.
- ¹⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁶ Ibid.
- ¹⁷ Dwight H. Zakus, "The International Olympic Committee Tragedy, Farce, and Hypocrisy," *Sociology of Sport Journal* 9 (1992): 341.
- ¹⁸ Maynard Brichford, "Avery Brundage and Racism," in *Global and Cultural Critique: Problematizing the Olympic Games: Fourth International Symposium for Olympic Research*,

- eds. Robert K. Barney et al. (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1998), 131.
- ¹⁹ Colin Tatz, "Race, Politics, and Sport," *Sporting Traditions* 1, no. 1 (1984): 18; see also, Guttman, *The Games Must Go On*, 73.
- ²⁰ Brichford, "Brundage and Racism," 131.
- ²¹ Sam Ramsamy, "Apartheid and Olympism: On the Abolishment of Institutionalized Discrimination in International Sport," in *Sport...The Third Millennium: Proceedings of the International Symposium, Quebec City, Canada, May 21-25, 1990*, eds. Fernand Landry, Marc Landry, and Magdeleine Yerlès (Sainte-Foy: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1991), 538.
- ²² As Brichford stated: "Brundage cited his removal of the 1920s track and field championships from New Orleans, which 'would not accept negro entries.' In rebutting charges of anti-Semitism, he mentioned that he had a Jewish private secretary and listed his Jewish associates ... He also cited the 1935 German promises to avoid discrimination, their removal of the anti-Semitic signs at Olympic facilities, and the IOC's blockage of a move to relieve Lewald. He cites the IOC's 1968 suspension of Indonesia for refusing admittance to an Israeli team. He added that his golf club had many Jewish members and that his businesses had employed many negroes and Jews. He concluded with a statement that the Olympic Games 'will proceed ... open to all qualified athletes regardless of race, color, religion or political affiliation.'" (Brichford, "Brundage and Racism," 132).
- ²³ Tatz, "Race and Sport," 15.
- ²⁴ Guttman, *The Games Must Go On*, 196.
- ²⁵ Richard E. Lapchick, "The Olympic Movement and Racism: An Analysis in Historical Perspective," *Africa Today* 17, no. 6 (1970): 14.
- ²⁶ John M. Hoberman, "Olympic Universalism and the Apartheid Issue," in *Sport...The Third Millennium: Proceedings of the International Symposium, Quebec City, Canada, May 21-25, 1990*, eds. Fernand Landry et al. (Sainte-Foy: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1991), 523.
- ²⁷ Ibid, 527.
- ²⁸ I use the expression, 'South African situation', to refer to the quandary of resolving the discriminatory effects of apartheid in South African sport, in a manner acceptable to the IOC, thus facilitating SANOC's continued membership in the IOC and Olympic Movement, and its participation in the Olympic Games.
- ²⁹ Allen Guttman, *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994).
- ³⁰ Ibid.
- ³¹ George Vandergriff Wright Jr., "Racism in Sport: An Update," *Africa Today* 21, no. 2 (1974): 9.
- ³² Robert Archer and Antoine Bouillon, *The South African Game: Sport and Racism* (London: Zed Press, 1982), 2.
- ³³ Douglas Booth, *The Race Game: Sport and Politics in South Africa* (Portland: Cass Publishers, 1998), 10.
- ³⁴ Archer and Bouillon, *South African Game*, 17.
- ³⁵ Booth, *Race Game*, 13.
- ³⁶ Archer and Bouillon, *South African Game*, 25.

- ³⁷ Coloureds refers to the combination of the mixed raced (consisting of one white parent), Indian (people who trace their descent back to India), and Asian populations.
- ³⁸ Nancy L. Clark and William H. Worger, *South Africa: The Rise and Fall of Apartheid* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2004), 22.
- ³⁹ Ibid, 22-3..
- ⁴⁰ Ibid, 23.
- ⁴¹ Dennis Brutus, "The Blacks and the Whites in Sport," *Africa Today* 17, no. 6 (1970): 3.
- ⁴² Sam Ramsamy, *Apartheid: The Real Hurdle: Sport in South Africa and the International Boycott* (London: International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa, 1982), 9-10.
- ⁴³ Booth, *Race Game*, 87.
- ⁴⁴ Ian Brittain, "South Africa, Apartheid and the Paralympic Games," *Sport in Society* 14, no. 9 (2011): 1165.
- ⁴⁵ Clark and Worger, *The Rise and Fall*.
- ⁴⁶ Ibid, 54
- ⁴⁷ Ibid, 51.
- ⁴⁸ Archer and Bouillon, *South African Game*, 42-3.
- ⁴⁹ Chris De Broglio, *South Africa: Racism in Sport* (London: Christian Action Publications, 1970), 6.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid, 6.
- ⁵¹ Joan Brickhill, *Race against Race: South Africa's "Multinational" Sport Fraud* (London: International Defence and Aid Fund, 1976), 6. See also, March Krotee and Luther C. Schwick, "The Impact of Sporting Forces on South African Apartheid," *Journal of Sport & Social Issues* 3, no. 1 (1979): 33.
- ⁵² Maxine Grace, "Origin and Development of Governmental Sports Policies in the Republic of South Africa: Sport and Separate Development," in *1974 Proceedings of the Society on the History of Physical Education and Sport in Asia and Pacific Area*, ed. Uriel Simri (Netanya: Wingate Institute for Physical Activity and Sport, 1979), 108.
- ⁵³ Booth, *Race Game*, 61-2.
- ⁵⁴ Marc Keech, "The Ties that Bind: South Africa and Sports Diplomacy 1958-1963," *The Sports Historian* 21, no. 1 (2001): 75.
- ⁵⁵ Sam Ramsamy, "Apartheid, Boycotts and the Games," in *Five-ring Circus: Money, Power and Politics at the Olympic Games*, eds. Alan Tomlinson, and Gary Whannel (London: Puto Press, 1984), 45. See also, Ramsamy, "Apartheid Olympism," 540. In response to the increasing injustices against non-whites, the domestic resistant forces of the African National Congress (ANC) and Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC) established underground organizations in 1961 to continue their plight against the government. For more detail about the ANC and PAC struggles, see Clark and Worger, *The Rise and Fall*.
- ⁵⁶ Keech, "Ties That Bind," 75.
- ⁵⁷ Booth, *Race Game*, 61. See also, Mary Draper, *Sport and Race in South Africa* (Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations, 1963), 5.
- ⁵⁸ Scarlett Cornelissen, "Resolving 'the South Africa Problem': Transnational Activism, Ideology and Race in the Olympic Movement, 1960-91," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 28, no. 1 (2011): 152.
- ⁵⁹ De Broglio, *South Africa Racism*, 1.
- ⁶⁰ Keech, "Ties That Bind," 73.

- ⁶¹ Brutus was a leader in the anti-apartheid sport movement who was well-known for his campaign to ban South Africa from the Olympic Games.
- ⁶² Cornelissen, "Resolving South Africa," 158.
- ⁶³ Brutus, "Blacks and Whites," 4.
- ⁶⁴ Andrew Honey, "South Africa and the Olympic Movement," in *Bridging Three Centuries: Intellectual Crossroads and the Modern Olympic Movement: Fifth International Symposium for Olympic Research*, eds. Kevin Wamsley et al. (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 2000), 178
- ⁶⁵ Ironically, article 2(7) of the United Nations Charter forbidding outside interference in domestic affairs shielded South Africa throughout the 1950s. See March L. Krotee, "Apartheid and Sport: South Africa Revisited," *Sociology of Sport Journal* 5 (1988): 127-8 for more detail.
- ⁶⁶ Krotee, "Apartheid Revisited," 135 (Endnote 3).
- ⁶⁷ Brickhill, *Race Against Race*, 9.
- ⁶⁸ Brittain, "South Africa and the Paralympics," 1168.
- ⁶⁹ As an integral member of SASA and later the South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee, Brutus was constantly harassed by police and government authorities. In 1961 he was restricted through the Suppression of Communism Act which prevented him from joining any organizations, to pursue his professions, and being able to attend a gathering of more than two people. He was arrested in 1963 for being at a gathering of more than two people when he had gone to present the non-racial case to a journalist in the offices of SANOC who was going to report back to the IOC. He tried to leave the country to attend the IOC debate in Switzerland about South Africa's participation in the 1964 Olympics, but was arrested by the Portuguese secret police in Mozambique. After being handed to South African officials, he tried to draw attention to himself by escaping into a crowded Johannesburg street when he was shot in the stomach by the police and left there to wait for a non-white ambulance to arrive. As he recovered in the prison hospital, he was sentenced to eighteen month imprisonment, only to be banned again once he was released from prison. See Brickhill, *Race Against Race*, 56.
- ⁷⁰ De Broglio, *South Africa Racism*, 3-4
- ⁷¹ In the literature, there is some confusion about which Soviet representative actually tabled the apartheid issue – it was either General Stortschev, Nikolai Romanov, or Alexei Romanov.
- ⁷² Lapchick, "Olympic Movement and Racism," 15.
- ⁷³ Keech, "Ties That Bind," 74.
- ⁷⁴ International Olympic Committee, *The Olympic Games: Fundamental Principles, Rules and Regulations, General Information* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 1962), 9. See also, Brichford, "Brundage and Racism," 129.
- ⁷⁵ Shane Quick, "'Black Knight Checks White King': The Conflict between Avery Brundage and the African Nations over South Africa Membership in the IOC," *Canadian Journal of History of Sport* 21, no. 2 (1990): 21.
- ⁷⁶ Ibid, 21.
- ⁷⁷ Ibid, 21-2.
- ⁷⁸ Booth, *Race Game*, 77-8.
- ⁷⁹ In 1961, Emery even asked Brundage to forward any correspondence from SASA so SANOC can monitor the group's activities. See Donald Macintosh, Hart Cantelon, and Lisa

- McDermott, "The IOC and South Africa: A Lesson in Transnational Relations," *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 28, no. 4 (1993): 378.
- ⁸⁰ Brutus, "Blacks and Whites," 4-5.
- ⁸¹ Archer and Bouillon, *South African Game*.
- ⁸² Ibid, 49.
- ⁸³ De Broglio, *South Africa Racism*, 4.
- ⁸⁴ Quick, "Black Knight," 20. See also, Shane Quick, "Black Knight Checks White King: The Conflict between African Bloc Nations and Avery Brundage during the 1960's." (MA thesis, The University of Western Ontario, 1987).
- ⁸⁵ P.M.H. Bell, *The World Since 1945: An International History* (London: Arnold, 2001), 243-4.
- ⁸⁶ Ibid, 21.
- ⁸⁷ Morgan Naidoo, "Problems Confronting Our Sport," *Africa Today* 17, no. 6 (1970): 19-20.
- ⁸⁸ Booth, *Race Game*, 88.
- ⁸⁹ Richard Espy, *The Politics of the Olympic Games: With an Epilogue, 1976-1980* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 94-5.
- ⁹⁰ Espy, *Politics of the Games*, 97.
- ⁹¹ Ibid, 98.
- ⁹² Bruce Kidd, "The Campaign against Sport in South Africa," *International Journal* 43, no. 4 (1988): 653.
- ⁹³ Clark and Worger, *The Rise and Fall*.
- ⁹⁴ Ramsamy, *Apartheid Hurdle*.
- ⁹⁵ Espy, *Politics of the Games*, 98-9.
- ⁹⁶ Ramsamy, "Apartheid Boycott," 46.
- ⁹⁷ Ibid, 47.
- ⁹⁸ Conflicting reports exist in the secondary literature about the results of the report. According to Maureen Margaret Smith, "Revisiting South Africa and the Olympic Movement: The Correspondence of Reginald S. Alexander and the International Olympic Committee, 1961-86," *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 23, no. 7 (2006): 1196, and Peter Hain, *Don't Play with Apartheid: The Background to the Stop the Seventy Tour Campaign* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1971), 65, the three person commission approved South Africa's re-entry into the 1968 Olympic Games.
- ⁹⁹ Macintosh, Cantelon, and McDermott, "Transnational Relations," 382.
- ¹⁰⁰ Ramsamy, "Apartheid Boycott," 48.
- ¹⁰¹ Espy, *Politics of the Games*, 103-4.
- ¹⁰² Brutus, "Blacks and Whites," 3.
- ¹⁰³ Maxine Grace Hunter, "The United Nations and the Anti-Apartheid in Sport Movement," *Canadian Journal of History of Sport & Physical Education* 11, no. 1 (1980): 20.
- ¹⁰⁴ Ibid, 28.
- ¹⁰⁵ Ramsamy, "Apartheid Olympism," 542.
- ¹⁰⁶ Cornelissen, "Resolving South Africa," 159.
- ¹⁰⁷ Ibid, 155.
- ¹⁰⁸ Archer and Bouillon, *South African Game*, 194-5.

- ¹⁰⁹ Brutus, "Blacks and Whites," 5.
- ¹¹⁰ Matti Gøksyr, "'One Certainly Expected a Great Deal More from the Savages': The Anthropology Days in St. Louis, 1904, and Their Aftermath," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 7, no. 2 (1990): 297.
- ¹¹¹ Booth alluded to the similarities between the Nazi regime in Germany and the Afrikaner regime in South Africa, "... apartheid sport and Nazi sport shared a more fundamental racial position: Nazis believed that only Aryans could play sport, and that only sports people of sound moral character could represent the nation; Afrikaner nationalists refused to award Springbok colours to blacks until the mid-1970s – only whites could represent the nation" (Booth, *Race Game*, 39).
- ¹¹² Richard Lapchick, "A Political History of the Modern Olympic Games," in *Fractured Focus: Sport as a Reflection of Society*, ed. Richard E. Lapchick (Toronto: D.C. Heath and Company, 1986), 331.
- ¹¹³ Tatz, "Race and Sport," 18.
- ¹¹⁴ Lapchick, "Political History," 333. Lapchick also points out, "In a setting that added irony to the situation, the AOC meeting was held in the New York Athletic Club, which barred Jewish membership."
- ¹¹⁵ Guttmann, *The Games Must Go On*, 90-5. See also, Frederic Cople Jaher, "Antisemitism in American Athletics," *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies* 20, no. 1 (2001): 61-73.
- ¹¹⁶ Guttmann, *The Games Must Go On*, 81. Although it was widely believed that Brundage received a seat on the IOC because of his support for the 1936 Berlin Games, a replacement was needed for the United States representative on the IOC and Brundage was the most qualified person, regardless of his support for the Berlin Games. The closest competition to represent the United States on the IOC was Gustavus Kirby, but Coubertin did not support his candidacy.
- ¹¹⁷ Tatz, "Race and Sport," 25.
- ¹¹⁸ Ramsamy, "Apartheid Olympism," 545.
- ¹¹⁹ Ibid.
- ¹²⁰ Espy, *Politics of the Games*, 104.
- ¹²¹ Some examples include Espy, *Politics of the Games*; Ramsamy, "Apartheid Boycott;" Ramsamy, "Apartheid Olympism;" Tatz, "Race and Sport;" and, Alfred E. Senn, *Power, Politics, and the Olympic Games* (Champaign: Human Kinetics, 1999).
- ¹²² Some examples include Lucas, "A String of Pearls;" Zakus, "International Tragedy;" and, Lapchick, "Political History."
- ¹²³ Heinz Schöbel, *The Four Dimensions of Avery Brundage* (Leipzig: Edition Leipzig, 1968).
- ¹²⁴ Guttmann, *The Games Must Go On*.
- ¹²⁵ As mentioned in a previous section, *Avery Brundage and the IOC's position on Race and Sport*, there is obvious evidence of Brundage using anti-Semitic language in his personal letters.
- ¹²⁶ Brichford, "Brundage the Man."
- ¹²⁷ Ibid, 245.
- ¹²⁸ Brichford, "Brundage Internationalization."
- ¹²⁹ Brichford, "Brundage and Racism."
- ¹³⁰ Brichford, "Brundage Internationalization," 141.

- ¹³¹ Draper, *Sport and Race*.
- ¹³² Naidoo, "Problems Confronting."
- ¹³³ Lapchick, "Olympic Movement and Racism."
- ¹³⁴ See endnote 61.
- ¹³⁵ Brutus, "Blacks and Whites."
- ¹³⁶ De Broglio, *South Africa Racism*.
- ¹³⁷ Hain, *Don't Play*.
- ¹³⁸ Using South Africa's experience with the Olympic Movement and Avery Brundage as a contextualization tool happens elsewhere such as in the works of Keech, "Ties That Bind," and Brittain, "South Africa and the Paralympics," to help focus in on other aspects of South Africa, apartheid and sport. For example, Keech examines sport diplomacy from 1958-63 with regard to South Africa with the main focus of the work is on two other sports administrators – K.S. Duncan, who is the Honorary Secretary of the Commonwealth Games and Sir Stanley Rous, who is the President of FIFA. While Brittain focuses on the Paralympic Games and South Africa's expulsion from the disability movement.
- ¹³⁹ Brickhill, *Race Against Race*.
- ¹⁴⁰ Ibid, 5.
- ¹⁴¹ Krotee and Schwick, "Sporting Forces."
- ¹⁴² Krotee, "Apartheid Revisited."
- ¹⁴³ Hunter, "United Nations Anti-apartheid."
- ¹⁴⁴ Ramsamy, *Apartheid Hurdle*.
- ¹⁴⁵ Archer and Bouillon, *South African Game*.
- ¹⁴⁶ Booth, *Race Game*.
- ¹⁴⁷ See Cornelissen, "Resolving South Africa" for a similar argument.
- ¹⁴⁸ Quick, "Black Knight," 21-2.
- ¹⁴⁹ Ibid.
- ¹⁵⁰ Ibid, 23.
- ¹⁵¹ Ibid, 24.
- ¹⁵² Macintosh, Cantelon, and McDermott, "Transnational Relations," 374.
- ¹⁵³ Ibid, 375-6.
- ¹⁵⁴ Cantelon and McDermott, "Charisma Organization," passim.
- ¹⁵⁵ Ibid, 39.
- ¹⁵⁶ Ibid, 40.
- ¹⁵⁷ Ibid, 43
- ¹⁵⁸ Ibid, 44.
- ¹⁵⁹ Smith, "Revisiting South Africa," 1193.
- ¹⁶⁰ Ibid, 1194.
- ¹⁶¹ Ibid, 1196.
- ¹⁶² Douglas Booth, "Sport Historians: What do we do? How do we do it?" in *Deconstructing Sport History: A Postmodern Analysis*, ed. Murray G. Phillips (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006). See also, Doug Booth, "Narrative Form: Understanding

Representations of Olympic Pasts," *Olympika. International Journal of Olympic Studies* 22 (2013), 91-112.

¹⁶³ Booth, "Sport Historians," 29-30.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 32.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ Victoria Paraschak and Susan Tirone, "Race and Ethnicity in Canadian Sport," in *Canadian Sport Sociology*, ed. Jane Crossman (Toronto: Thomson Nelson, 2003).

¹⁶⁷ Ibid.

¹⁶⁸ Maynard Brichford (ed.), *Avery Brundage Collection 1907-1975*. Schriftenreihe des Bundesinstituts für Sportwissenschaft Band 12. Schorndorf, FRG: Verlag Karl Hofmann, 1975.

¹⁶⁹ International Olympic Committee. *IOC Executive Committee Minutes, Volume II, (1948-1969), Volume IV (1956-1988)*. Translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg. London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992.

Chapter Two:

Avery Brundage, the South African National Olympic Committee, and the Birth of the Non-White Resistance, 1955-1960

1. Introduction

Although Avery Brundage was an avid believer in a non-political International Olympic Committee (IOC), Olympic Games, and Olympic Movement, the IOC itself was a transnational political body. Member individuals and countries are chosen based on the ability to spread the IOC's ideological brand of Olympism. Further, the IOC was much about relationships between the members and countries which compose the modern Olympic Movement. Brundage's connections to the IOC began while he was the President of the American Olympic Association. He became an IOC member in 1936, and his importance within the IOC increased when he became Vice President in 1946. It was during his tenure as IOC Vice President that relationships between Brundage and the South African representatives evolved, which, combined with Brundage's Olympic Movement ideals, set the tone for his approach to the South African issue when he ultimately became President. When Brundage rose to the Presidency, he, in effect, became the face of the Olympic Movement. With this privileged position came the responsibility of dealing with people and organizations that wanted their voices to be heard. Therefore, not only was Brundage prompted towards developing a working relationship with IOC affiliates, he also had to deal with

internal as well as global developments. This was most certainly apparent in the case of South Africa in the modern Olympic Movement.

There are four main forces to consider in examining the issue of South African participation in the Olympic Games and membership of the IOC: (1) President Brundage and the IOC itself; (2) the role of South African Olympic affiliates; (3) domestic resistance within South Africa; and, lastly, (4) the international community. As the South African issue developed from the mid-1950s to South Africa's expulsion in 1970, the message and position of each of these stakeholders varied.

Since a network of correspondents – centering on Brundage as IOC President, the IOC and extending out into the sphere of the international Olympic community – is the focus of this inquiry, he is posited and examined here as expressing the position of the IOC on the South African issue. Personal advice provided by other individuals involved with the IOC notwithstanding, it was ultimately Brundage who formulated the IOC's message. Then, in the ten years leading up to the 1960 Rome Games, in addition to Brundage and the IOC, the position and message of the other three stakeholders began to develop. Brundage was challenged to manage and negotiate with these three voices to arrive at a stance and course of action that he could consider to be satisfactory. Therefore, in this and the two chapters that follow, I will provide a detailed examination of the message and position of the four stakeholders as expressed in the voluminous correspondence accessible in the Avery Brundage Collection (ABC). I will conclude each chapter with a discussion of Brundage's resolutions and position on the issue as influenced by the exchanges with the respective stakeholders.

2. South African Olympic Affiliates

Correspondence between Avery Brundage and the IOC representative for South Africa, Reginald Honey, commenced as early as 1949.¹ In his first letter to Brundage, Honey requested his assistance for South African National Olympic Committee (SANOC)² member, Dr. Ernst Jokl, during a visit to the USA. Almost two months later, Brundage responded in kind, pointing to correspondence with Dr. Jokl, and mentioning that he would do everything he could to assist Jokl. As well, Brundage stated that he looked forward to seeing Honey at the next IOC session in Rome.³ Correspondence from the subsequent year, 1950, indicated another connection between Brundage and South African sports, namely, between Brundage and the Honorary Secretary of SANOC, Ira Emery. In Emery's initial letter, dated 19 May 1950, he provided Brundage with a listing of the past and current members of SANOC and South African IOC representatives, as well as a detailed account of SANOC's selection process for its national Olympic team. "The [South African National Olympic Committee] selects its South African team from the nominations received," stated Emery, "in accordance with the money available at the time of selection."⁴ What was unique about this particular letter was a series of questions posed by Emery to the IOC:

(a) Can a National Body of Sport break away from the [South African National Olympic Committee] and enter direct to the Organizing committee of the Olympic Games and without reference to the National Olympic Committee.

(b) If the National Olympic Committee refuses to forward all nominations for a National Body of Sport, may the latter send their entries direct to the Organising Committee.

(c) In effect, is it permissible for a National Body of Sport whose full entry is not forwarded owing to lack of funds, to raise their own funds and enter direct to the Organising committee without reference to the National Olympic Committee? If this is no it could mean that in this country a wealthy National body could send a large team and a poorer association could not raise funds to send a team, thus the entry from this country would not be representative of the sport of this country, and therefore not a truly National team for an Olympic Games.

(d) It is pointed out that on no account does the national Olympic Council in South Africa alter the order in which National sports teams are nominated. For instance, if the National Athletic Union nominated 20 and we had only sufficient money to send 15 athletes, only the last five names would be deleted. Will the Organising Committee, in effect, accept only the entries forwarded by the National Olympic Committee of South Africa?⁵

These questions sought to clarify the power and authority of a National Olympic Committee (NOC) domestically, as well as within the Olympic structure generally. However, could these questions also be interpreted as guiding the development of proactive measures in anticipation of things to come in South Africa – were some National Sporting Federations (NSF) beginning to challenge the authority of SANOC? Any such considerations are not evidenced in Brundage's response to Emery; he merely referred Emery to the Olympic rule book and reaffirmed that the IOC only recognized the nominations and suggestions from the respective NOCs, who, in turn, received the nominations from NSFs.⁶ Brundage also offered suggestions on how to organize the funding and how to select South African participants to represent the country at the Olympic Games. Again, Brundage's helpful reply to Emery regarding these questions suggested that Brundage did not count on SANOC harbouring ulterior motives behind its questions, but was only seeking clarification of Olympic rules and regulations.

Some of the early informal letters between Brundage and South African Olympic affiliates continued to express a positive relationship. When Emery asked Brundage to meet with a friend, E. Garson-Walker, who might call upon him while visiting the USA,⁷ Brundage replied: "Because of our warm relations in the field of sport for so many years, we have always felt very close to South Africa and any sportsman from your country is assured of a warm welcome."⁸ Brundage ended his letter by asking, once again, that Emery convey his greetings to Honey. It was obvious that Brundage wished to keep a close connection with both Emery and Honey. Furthermore, there existed no evidence to suggest that Brundage and South African Olympic affiliates enjoyed anything other than an ongoing, friendly relationship prior to the period when the South African apartheid issue was to become a worry for the IOC.

It was not until a 22 September 1953 letter from Emery to Brundage that negative press news about the Olympic Games entered the correspondence.⁹ "These articles speak for themselves," stated Emery, "but I am sorry to say they are causing quite a deal of dissension. We are endeavouring always to keep the Olympic Movement in mind, but articles such as appeared here are not conducive to the public being at all pleased."¹⁰ Brundage responded quickly:

Sensational stories of this kind, of course, are not helpful to the Olympic Movement, but it is difficult to prevent newspapers from featuring articles of this sort even though they are quite ridiculous. We have the same trouble everywhere. That is why one of the most important duties of National Olympic Committees is to teach the public (and that means the newspapers also) the philosophy of the Olympic Games and the code of amateur sport.¹¹

Emery's letter, and Brundage's reply, referred to amateur sport and paid athletes being allowed to participate in the Games, which was becoming a hot button issue within the Olympic Movement.

In a subsequent letter from Emery to Brundage, their friendly relationship continued unharmed by such negative reporting.¹² In his response, Brundage thanked Emery for the letter, and mentioned: "Our greatest troubles today come from commercial and political interference.... If they are ready to support the ideals of the movement, very good, but many seek to take and not to give. In a materialistic world it is a continuous battle to maintain our high standards."¹³ This amicable interaction between Emery and Brundage created a relationship close enough also to exchange information on sensitive Olympic matters, such as Russia's, Poland's, and Hungary's teams possibly training in China to prepare for the 1956 Games scheduled for Melbourne, Australia.¹⁴

Nonetheless, this amicable relationship between Brundage and Emery was cast in doubt in January 1956, when a letter from Emery to Brundage, for the first time, focused on apartheid in South Africa: "I am given to understand you were more than diplomatic when the question of the 'colour bar' came up at the meeting of the IOC in Paris and in view of that I thought perhaps you might wish to be informed of opinion in this country from the highest levels of this very contentious subject."¹⁵ Emery went on to hint at a potential future 'overreaction' by the IOC, using football as an example: "How far the present international football delegation will get with their enquiry in South Africa (they are at present in Johannesburg) I do not know but one has the feeling that if they are not exceedingly careful they will do irreparable damage to

European international sport in this country.”¹⁶ In his response, Brundage clearly reiterated his and the IOC’s position:

I am more or less familiar with the problems in your country and, as a matter of fact, we have a situation here due to misguided legislation that is equally serious.... I do know that these situations are very delicate and have to be handled with the utmost care. We, of course, have the problem of our fundamental principle, which requires that we welcome the youth of the world regardless of color, creed or politics.¹⁷

This initial interaction regarding the South African issue was telling. Brundage fully supported Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter*, which was a fundamental principle that included: “No discrimination is allowed against any country or person on ground of race, religion or politics.”¹⁸ Therefore, this and any future support for Article 1 appeared to have signaled to Emery the possibility of a confrontation with the IOC. Nonetheless, the South African racial issue was not then as pressing for Brundage as one might expect in retrospect. In two letters to Reginald Honey in February and April of 1956, Brundage did not mention the South African racial situation even in passing.¹⁹

The South African issue did not resurface until three months later. On 12 June 1956, Emery sent a follow-up letter to Brundage, updating him on the results of the football inquiry previously mentioned. “I drop this short note to you,” wrote Emery, “expressing my very great pleasure at the decision of the International Football Association not to accede to the demands by the Coloured Football Association for another two years.”²⁰ Further, Emery added: “When I am in Melbourne I will tell you personally and confidentially the whole of the setup in this country, as I am not a member of the IOC and can express my views publicly. I am quite sure that if I speak

to you ... a lot of bother might be saved.”²¹ The “whole of the setup” referred to the structure of the sport system and the politics surrounding the decisions made in reference to domestic and international sport in South Africa. Emery was willing, indeed eager, to explain the South African sporting situation to Brundage.

Over a year later, the pace of events surrounding the South African issue increased as Emery asked for Brundage’s advice:

You will see from my letter that it is quite impossible for non-Europeans and Europeans to compete with or against each other in South Africa and if any International Federation were to demand that we must accept non-Europeans in our teams, we could not possibly do so. As you know, Uganda, Kenya and Algeria have separate Olympic Committees and perhaps you, yourself, could suggest a way out of this impasse. The position is very serious as the demands coming from the non-European bodies for affiliation to the European bodies and the right to compete with South Africans at trials for inclusion in Olympic teams are being fostered for political reasons.... As I write this letter in confidence, I can inform you very definitely that there would not be 1% of the millions of non-Europeans in this country who would care to train with and compete with Europeans. You will notice further in my letter that extreme difficulty will be found for the Bantu, the Cape Coloured and the Indian ever to agree in policy if they had one Association representing them all.²²

Emery’s letter ended with an encouragement extended to Brundage to visit South Africa in order to “see for [him]self the position regarding the non-European and European policy in this country.”²³ No other interpretation can be gained from Emery’s letter than a request to the IOC to become involved in the South African situation. However, he did try to prevent the racial implications by choosing the labels ‘European’ and ‘non-European’ instead of white and non-white. After all, Emery was mounting an argument to maintain the status quo without being racist. He was convinced that the white and non-white populations would not be able to cooperate,

afraid, too, that International Sport Federations (ISF) might try to force the two groups to mesh in South Africa, an act that would threaten the racialized state of domestic sport. Emery, feeling pressured from domestic groups, asked the IOC to recognize representation from both groups, although he ultimately argued that the non-white bodies requested representation for political reasons, rather than for sporting reasons. Further, despite Emery appearing to be certain that the number of non-white athletes interested in competing with white sportsmen was extremely low, and it would be virtually impossible to assemble a sport body to represent the three non-white groups, he could have been creating invalidated premises for his argument to maintain the racial status quo.

Within the same 27 November 1957 letter given to Brundage, Emery provided further information, which included a copy of Emery's personal letter to Eugène Gouleau, Secretary of the International Weightlifting Association (i.e., *Fédération Internationale Haltérophile et Culturiste*). Emery requested a favour from Gouleau: "You will recall also that you asked my help in the voting so that you would be appointed as President of the International Weight-lifting Federation. I pointed out to you the difficulty that would arise if your Federation demanded that non-Europeans must take part in sport against Europeans in South Africa."²⁴ There was little doubt that Emery was concerned with the rise of the non-racial South African Amateur Weightlifting and Bodybuilding Federation (SAAWBF):

European Governing bodies of sport in South Africa have at all times offered assistance, financially and actively, in helping non-Europeans to take part in amateur sport and it is mainly through Government subsidies and subsidies by various Public Bodies that it made it possible for non-Europeans to take part in amateur sport in this country. This is particularly the case in regard to the thousands

of Africans who are employed on the Mines. Insofar as these people are concerned, they have no wish to take part in sport outside their own areas and it is only a few people who are controlling the non-European Weight-lifting Association who are pressing, and we think for political reasons only, their claims to take part with South Africa at the Olympic Games.²⁵

Here, Emery defended the racism of the white governing bodies by pointing out that white groups offered assistance to non-white groups to take part in amateur sport, and at the same time, critically stated that it was only the political motives of a select few from the SAAWBF who wanted representation at the Olympic Games. Further, Emery reminded Gouleau of issues that might arise by championing the cause of non-European sport bodies in South Africa and offered suggestions on how to deal with non-Europeans:

I will suggest to you now that if you grant direct affiliation to your body by any non-European body in South Africa you will find that before long you will have applications for affiliation from the Bantu (native), Cape Coloured and Indians as we have found for years past that these three races will not agree among each other and I personally feel you will have extreme difficulty in having a recognised South African body among these three races. Since time immemorial, the non-Europeans and the Europeans have never mixed socially or in sport in South Africa. It is the policy of the country and a policy that will be never removed. I am suggesting to Mr. Avery Brundage that the question of the non-Europeans in South Africa must be discussed at a meeting of the International Olympic Committee to see if some way out cannot be found to permit the non-Europeans from South Africa being represented at the Olympic Games even if it means sending two separate teams. The International Olympic Committee created a precedent by dividing China into Nationalist China and Communist China, allowing them to send separate teams. I have been Secretary of the [South African National Olympic Committee] for 45 years and it is only in the past 12 months that we have received any applications for non-Europeans to represent South Africa with Europeans overseas. I would suggest further that if your Association were to demand our accepting non-Europeans to travel with and compete with South African Europeans, we would not be able to do so and you would be losing the substance for the shadow.²⁶

A month later Brundage responded to Emery: “Unfortunately, however, one of the fundamental principles of the Olympic Movement is involved and therefore I cannot give you an answer. I shall give more thought to the subject and perhaps discuss it confidentially at the next meeting of our Executive Board.”²⁷ Brundage avoided providing a response to the now dramatically complicated situation. Although he hinted at discussing it at the subsequent IOC Executive Board meeting, the issue was not formally raised until the 22 May 1959 meeting in Munich.²⁸

Two months after Brundage sent his brief letter to Emery, the IOC President received a reply from Emery, further extending his argument that non-white groups would not be able to organize single representation. He also reminded Brundage that the South African issue was a domestic matter:

I now send a cutting from to-days [sic] Johannesburg Daily Newspaper from which you will see that the Africans, that is Bantu, want less co-operation of Indians, coloureds and European interests. This bears out entirely what I have told Mr. Gouleau and I humbly suggest that your Executive does nothing at all in this matter until we write to you again an official letter in this connection.... We are doing our best to solve this problem ourselves, and we are the only people who can solve this problem, as nobody can solve it for us. We will write you fully after the 18th March and one of our Country’s representatives will endeavour to make personal contact with you or your Executive.²⁹

This was the first time that Emery requested Brundage and the IOC not to involve themselves in the South African issue. SANOC wanted to try to control the issue itself without IOC intervention towards a resolution of the situation. After not hearing from Emery for six weeks, Brundage wrote to Emery for an update:

Pressure is mounting and I am receiving many protests and requests for official statements from all over the world. While our rules are quite clear, as you know, I have as yet made no pronouncement. Sooner or later, and probably sooner, the matter will be placed on

our agenda, and there can only be one result.... In your letter you say 'We are doing our best to solve this problem ourselves and we are the only people who can solve this problem, as nobody can solve it for us.' I am sympathetic to your point of view because we have similar problems in this country, which have not always been handled wisely. I hope, therefore, that you can develop a policy and a program that will solve this thorny problem and that we will hear from you shortly.³⁰

Obviously, the South African issue and SANOC's handling of the issue garnered greater attention from Brundage. He was well aware that something had to be done soon; he could only stall on the issue for a limited amount of time. To Emery, he again stressed Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter*. The pressure mounted intensely for Emery and SANOC to develop a policy and program to solve the racial discrimination issue.

On 18 April 1958, Emery finally responded to Brundage. First, in a private addition to the official correspondence, Emery stated:

I am quite sure that if you could persuade your Executive not to have this matter fully discussed until after the 1960 Games, I feel confident that there will be some solution as far as this country is concerned. It would be rather tragic if any action were taken that would compel us to withdraw from the Olympic Games in 1960.... You will remember in Melbourne you said as far as you could see no action would be taken in this matter to prevent South Africa taking part in the 1960 Games.... Again I state we are doing our best to overcome this difficulty, but it is not an easy matter and I will keep you posted as to what is happening.³¹

Emery's plea to Brundage to postpone the major discussion on the South African issue until after the 1960 Games, allowing South Africa to take part in the Games, insured their presence in Rome in 1960.

In the official part of the 18 April letter, Emery provided a lengthy explanation of non-European and European participation in South Africa in regard to the Olympic Games. He explained that the South African Olympic team had consisted entirely of

Europeans because of traditional policy based on social grounds. Emery then proceeded to discuss the suitability of non-white athletes as members of the Olympic team. First, he made the point that most non-white sportsmen were professional, which excluded them from Olympic competition; and second, those who were considered amateur did not possess the necessary skills to compete on an international level. Then, Emery raised the issue of claiming unfairness for political purpose:

In recent years the Non-European sportsmen in South Africa have adopted the attitude that they are unfairly excluded from participation in what can be called 'International Sport'. Certain Non-European Sportsmen have called into being, quite irregularly, 'sporting bodies' and excluding the colour bar from their Constitution. These bodies are now making representations that inasmuch as the existing [South African National Olympic Committee] restricts competition to Europeans, the existing Association should be expelled from the International Olympic Committee and replaced by the wholly incompetent and useless bodies that the Non-Europeans have formed and are forming.... We in South Africa appreciate that these mushroom associations will never be able to accomplish anything useful, but unfortunately overseas opinion is tending to reprobate our traditional attitude.... The [South African National Olympic Committee] is well aware that the applications now being made by a few non-Europeans in this country for the right to compete with Europeans in the South African Team at the Olympic Games are being made mainly for political purposes.³²

To this, Emery added further details on the conditions and procedure for non-white athletes to become legitimately considered for international competition:

Several of the South African Governing Bodies of Sport in South Africa are willing to permit the affiliation of Non-European bodies to their Associations, providing their representatives are Europeans. The information which the South African Sporting Federations require before affiliation could be granted is as follows: (1) The Constitution of its Association and whether it includes BANTU (NATIVE), INDIANS and CAPE COLOURED. (2) The names and addresses of the officials of the Non-European Provincial

Associations. (3) The number of Clubs in each Province, the number of active competitors and the venues in which competitions are held by the Non-Europeans and under whose control.... Providing the South African Governing Bodies of Sport can obtain this information (WHICH THEY HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO DO SINCE 1947) affiliation would in all probability be granted. Also providing the Non-European sports bodies in this country WERE PROPERLY CONSTITUTED AND REPRESENTED, that is the BANTU (NATIVE), THE INDIAN, AND THE CAPE COLOURED there would be no objection to one of their teams, or individuals, being given authority to compete in International Sport, PROVIDING THE EUROPEAN SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNING BODIES OF SPORT WERE SATISFIED WITH THE ABILITY OF THE NON-EUROPEAN COMPETITORS SO NOMINATED TO TAKE PART IN INTERNATIONAL SPORT.... when the so-called amateurs in the Non-European sections of sport have been judged by Europeans who are recognised officials it has been found that their performances cannot match up to the European standards in this country.³³

Finally, Emery recommended meeting with Reginald Honey if the issue required immediate attention. To add to his argument, in a subsequent letter, Emery quoted the Rhodesian Empire and Olympic Games Association minutes to help explain SANOC's appeal to Brundage for his consideration in connection with this matter, by shifting responsibility to the respective sports governing bodies. Emery felt it was the responsibility of each NSF to choose the right time to augment the rules of their respective sports' charters to accommodate multi-racial teams.

After receiving the letters, Brundage responded to Emery by pointing out the urgency of the situation as the international pressure to resolve the South African issue increased:

I don't know how long we can defer action on this matter since we are receiving letters of protest from all over the world, and as you know, it has become an issue in Great Britain because of the Commonwealth Games this summer.... I read your report with sympathy because I am well acquainted with what happens in matters of this kind. You state that the individuals in question are neither amateurs nor of international class, and I am reasonably sure

you are correct. If you held separate tryouts, none of them would qualify on one ground or another, and you would comply with the rules. Why is this not the solution? ... Someone may raise this question at our meeting and I hope Mr. Honey will be there.³⁴

Brundage suggested a 'sporting' solution to the problem that would be in full compliance with the rules for qualification (and thus sidestep the political opprobrium). Less than two weeks later, Emery responded to Brundage's sense of urgency:

From this letter you will see the attitude which has been adopted by our Government, and I think the last paragraph represents the views expressed in all our previous correspondence ... nothing would please us better in this country if we could officially hold these separate Try Outs. At the moment it would be most unfair for us to attempt such Try Outs as the Non-Europeans' Associations are not formed through the country. There are a few mushroom bodies as pointed out previously who would submit candidates for Try Outs; this would not by any stretch of imagination represent the Non-Europeans in this country.... My Chairman and the members of our Council give you an assurance which you can pass on to the members of your Executive that the [South African National Olympic Committee] will do its utmost to comply with the rules of the International Olympic Committee, but your members must surely realise that until such times that the Non-Europeans are agreed amongst themselves as to what control they desire it is impossible for any European Association to arrange separate trials.³⁵

Clearly, Emery did not want the issue to be discussed at the IOC level because of the risk of being asked not to attend the 1960 Rome Games. Showing optimism, he even provided an example to support the progress he assured was being made:

As a matter of fact a Non-European Soccer Team and Athletic Team will leave this month from South Africa to take part in competition in the Federation i.e., Northern and Southern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. This is a step in the right direction; as a result of this we are confident we will be able to lead the Non-Europeans into the right way of thinking in so far as International Sport is concerned.³⁶

Emery needing to lead the non-white population “into the right way of thinking” indicated the non-whites were practicing the “wrong way of thinking” about international sport. Unfortunately, it was not clearly indicated by Emery if he was referring to a “white way” of practicing international sport or he was referring to how the international structure of sport and competition functioned in a certain way that the non-white population must learn.

In an effort to be transparent, Emery admitted that SANOC had a problem with the population of Indian origin which was seeking affiliation with the International Football Association and the weightlifting association. Emery also included a nine page memorandum from the Football Association of Southern Africa to FIFA and another document to Brundage outlining South African government policy.³⁷ Further, he left Brundage with a hopeful outlook on ways the issue could be resolved:

My Association may ask Mr. Honey to attend your meeting in Monaco and I sincerely trust that for the sake of the European Population in this country that no decision will be taken by your Executive or the International Committee debarring us from competition in Rome.... We have given you our assurance that as soon as the Non-Europeans are organised in this country and are affiliated to our own South African Governing Bodies of Sport, trials will be given these people providing that they will accept such trials.³⁸

In addition to the “official letter” to Brundage, a personal and confidential letter from Emery also dated 6 May 1958, reiterated much of the same argument. Four months later, on 11 September 1958, Emery wrote yet another personal letter to the IOC President:

I have been advised by a Mr. Brutus, a Coloured member of the non-European Weightlifting Association, who describes himself as an International Correspondent, that you have written to him at the time of the International Committee in Tokyo, advising him that you are asking my Association for a report on South Africa. If this is the

case, I respectfully state that I have not received such a letter from you, but all the reports we have previously written you from my Association officially are the correct versions.... We have now obtained a list of the names and addresses of the Chairman and Secretaries of the Associations in South Africa of this non-European Weightlifting body, and it is the first time such information has been received since our first request in 1947. We have asked the official European South African Amateur Weightlifting Association to interview these Chairman and Secretaries and to ascertain if these Clubs are genuine or not.³⁹

This letter marked the first instance demonstrating a disconnect in the communication between Emery and Brundage. Indeed, and of critical notation, it marked the first occasion that the name Dennis Brutus entered the narrative. Brutus, a representative of the SAAWBF, was an activist gaining non-white organization recognition within South Africa. As will become clearly evident, he was less than popular with Emery and SANOC. Nonetheless, in a quick follow-up to his note of 11 September, Emery sent another letter to Brundage suggesting evidence of the domestic struggle to organize non-whites. At the same time, he was trying to discredit Brutus and the SAAWBF:

[From the attached newspaper cutting] you will see that in the South African Parliament the Cape Coloureds Representative, Mr. G.S.P. Le Roux, said that the coloureds demanded that Apartheid [sic] should be applied between them and the Natives. In the penultimate paragraph of this extract you will see that the Minister of Native Affairs and the Prime [M]inister of South Africa, Dr. Verwoerd, said that he agreed that Apartheid [sic] should be applied not only between Coloured and Native, but also between Native and Indian, and furthermore not only the Coloureds were asking for this apartheid, but the Bantu races, such as Zulus, were asking for protection against the Indian.... From this true extract from our South African Government you will see how difficult and dangerous it might be for any of the International Sporting federations affiliated to the International Olympic Committee to accept any direct application made by a Non-European Association from South Africa.... We are convinced that Mr. Brutus the international Correspondent of the Non-European Weightlifting Association is not

only concerned with the welfare of Non-European Weightlifters in this country.⁴⁰

With all this in mind, a restive Brundage tried to allay Emery's concerns about the South African situation, while at the same time reminding him of the urgency of the situation:

Rest assured that the International Olympic Committee is not going to intervene in your domestic affairs. In any event, we do not recognize National Federations.... The only question is whether we can continue to recognise the [South African National Olympic Committee]. The subject has not yet been raised officially, but it probably will be in the near future, since we have begun to hear from other countries on this subject.... I am fully aware of your problems and the difficulty of solving them. I should think that perhaps the simplest way would be for the National Federations to have two or more sub-organizations to handle independently the different groups. Then for international competition each group could hold its own tryouts and a composite team could be selected from the winners of these tryouts soon.... I hope that you are making effort to solve this problem, since it will undoubtedly be placed on the agenda of one of our meetings.⁴¹

Brundage's remark on the question of the expulsion of SANOC quite possibly reflected the pressure felt by the IOC from other countries. Brundage encouraged Emery to solve the problem and again suggested to have separate tryouts organized by NSFs. In his response a few weeks later, Emery presented a new idea:

I am quite sure that sooner or later we will overcome this difficulty, but the only way is for the International Olympic Committee to permit two teams from South Africa.... We will keep in close contact with you in this matter, particularly in regard to when meetings of the International Olympic Committee are held, and then at your next meeting we will suggest how we think this matter can be overcome more expeditiously.⁴²

Emery's optimistic tone hinted that SANOC's solution might be the only course to follow. For the moment, he appeared to forget who was in charge of the Olympic Games, in effect, the IOC, not SANOC. Attached with Emery's letter was a copy of a

letter sent from Emery to SAAWBF, in which he noted that SAAWBF could not request affiliation to any international sports governing bodies because the South African Amateur Weightlifting Union (SAAWU) was already affiliated with SANOC. SANOC could not compel any Association to accept affiliation, but if SAAWU accepted SAAWBF, SANOC would have no objection. Further, Emery reminded SAAWBF secretary G.R. Smith:

The [South African National Olympic Committee] is doing its utmost with international Bodies to overcome the difficulties of the colour bar insofar as South Africa is concerned.... The [South African National Olympic Committee] would have to be satisfied if you become affiliated to the S.A. Amateur Weightlifting Association that your Association caters for all Non-Europeans, i.e. Bantu, Cape Coloured and Indian, and we think that this assurance will be asked for by the S.A. Amateur Weightlifting Association.... I do not think any good purpose will be served by dealing with your typewritten review of our discussions seriatim, and I can assure you that the S.A. Governing Bodies of Sport (European) are doing their utmost to try and overcome the colour bar insofar as overseas Teams are concerned. It is not possible to hasten this question more than we are doing at the moment. Perhaps more patience by your own Federation will bring better results.⁴³

After reviewing Emery's newest letter, as well as the attachment of the correspondence to the SAAWBF, Brundage reminded Emery of the urgency of the situation, emphasizing the value of having South African representation at future meetings:

I note that you are still trying to find a solution to the thorny race problems and I hope that you will be successful. I am reasonably sure, however, that the IOC will not accept two separate teams from your or any other country. I still think that separate tryouts with an impartial jury, as I suggested in my previous letters, might be the answer.... In any event, I hope that Mr. Honey will be present at our coming meeting in Munich next May. There is more and more pressure, as I told you, coming from different directions on this question and there should be someone present with a thorough

firsthand knowledge of the subject to present your point of view when it is discussed.⁴⁴

A week later, Emery once again assured Brundage that SANOC's actions would not cast doubt on the respectability of the IOC. "We appreciate the kind thoughts you express in your letter," wrote Emery, "and we are certainly taking action as far as this country is concerned so that your International Olympic Committee will not be embarrassed."⁴⁵ Emery followed up with another letter soon thereafter, maintaining the optimistic tone:

I am pleased to tell you that our Mr. Honey will attend the meeting of the International Olympic Committee in Munich next May. By that time I am convinced that the arrangements we will make regarding the competition by Non-Europeans will be satisfactory to the International Olympic Committee, and also to the International Sporting Federations.... Meantime it is our earnest request that nothing is done in the matter by your Committee until such time as our full and final report is placed before you in May.⁴⁶

Once again, Emery projected confidence that a consensus would be reached satisfactory to the IOC. Referring to public opinion, Emery enclosed a news item: "I send for your information a page from a Johannesburg paper, regarding the colour bar.... You will see even the Press are anxious that we can find a solution to this vexed question, and which I am sure we can do."⁴⁷ Such optimism might have been overstated, as reflected in a letter from Emery to Brundage less than a month later:

For your information I append an extract from a letter received from the S.A. Cycling Federation dated 22nd November, which will again give you the difficulties we are encountering in having the Non-European Associations applying for affiliation to any South African Governing Body of Sport.... I am still convinced that the Bantu, Cape Coloured and the Native in this country will never mix insofar as control for Non-Europeans is concerned, and I again state that the only troubles we are having are from a few non-European people in Port Elizabeth, not numbering more than one dozen, bringing all this matter up for political reasons.⁴⁸

A month later, to strengthen his case about the difficulties South Africa was experiencing to properly integrate the non-white population into the current sport system, Emery provided further newspaper article evidence that suggested to pursue the incorporation of the non-white population with caution:

This article indicates how extremely careful we must be in South Africa in the admittance of Non-Europeans to Governing Bodies of Sport until such time as we are certain that the Non-European Bodies will be able to adhere to the amateur rules and regulations which are required by International Bodies.⁴⁹

Mr. Bourquin [manager of Durban's Native Administration Department] says that growing tensions in Native sports organizations may – unless rectified – lead to serious disturbances.... In a two-page report Mr. Bourquin says that the Durban and District African Football Association, because of growing internal dissension, is 'becoming difficult to control and therefore represents a threat to law and order.'⁵⁰

A week later, Brundage received a letter from Emery with an attached letter that had been circulated to all ISFs and the British Empire and Commonwealth Games Federation (BECGF).⁵¹ In the circular, Emery discussed the affiliation of non-European sport associations. He announced that the first application made by the South African Bantu Amateur Athletic Association to the South African Amateur Athletic Association, had, in principle, been approved by satisfying three conditions:

- (1) The South African Bantu Amateur Athletic Association will be considered as a federation of clubs or associations and as such will be entitled to two representative votes on the parent body.
- (2) All competitive meetings organised by the non-European association are to be conducted in accordance with the recognised policy of trusteeship relating to non-European affairs practiced in South Africa.
- (3) Any problems in regard to racial questions which might arise will be dealt with in consultation with the Union Government.⁵²

Further, Emery provided details to all ISFs to explain what was happening in South Africa. Two weeks later, Brundage wrote a brief letter to Emery, reiterating that he was "... well aware of the difficulties presented by the racial problem in your country and I am glad to note that it has your continued attention. It is most important that Mr. Honey attends the next session of the IOC in Munich this coming May."⁵³

Unable to avoid the South African issue within the halls of the IOC any longer, Brundage realized that in Munich penetrating questions would be asked about South Africa. The issue was becoming more public and global by the day – Brundage referred Emery to a feature article, *The Tragic Story of South Africa*, in the 30 January 1959 issue of U.S. News & World Report.⁵⁴ Emery's response a week later, presented concerns relative to Brutus' involvement in the South African situation:

... I wrote you recently saying that application had been accepted by the South African Amateur Athletic Association of the Non-European Body, which is comprised of the Bantu (Native). You will see ... that our friend Mr. Brutus is again being difficult in this matter, and trying to upset the very fair arrangements which have been attempted. Mr. Brutus is an Indian, and insofar the applications for affiliation by the Non-Europeans have been most difficult. It is this type of gentleman who is causing the trouble in this country for the affiliation of the Non-Europeans. As you can see he does not wish to accept a subservient status. They want full control the same as the table tennis got and which has killed this sport in South Africa.⁵⁵

Clearly Emery viewed Brutus as an antagonist in South Africa, as well as a deterrent to unifying the non-white population to achieve affiliation to NSFs. Shorter and curter responses from Brundage began to signal exasperation and the erosion of their close connection. As the situation became more serious and entered the IOC's agenda, Brundage's correspondence tone became more formal. For example, in Brundage's next letter, he thanked Emery for the informative newspaper clippings, since the

clippings, "... indicate the difficulties that you face in trying to find a solution to the serious problems in your country;" he went on to "suggest that when Mr. Honey comes to our meeting in Munich next May that he is well supplied with information of this kind."⁵⁶ Brundage's message conveyed the challenge to South African Olympic affiliates to defend themselves against the accusation of racial discrimination within the sport system.

Two months later, Emery responded in a lengthy communication to Brundage. It included two attachments: one, a report from SANOC that dealt with the applications for affiliation for non-European sporting bodies; and, second, a letter from Emery to the Secretary of the International Athletic Federation.⁵⁷ In his personal letter, Emery had much to report, much of it of dire concern:

... it would appear that the question of Colour Bar at the 1960 Olympic Games in Rome is to be discussed by the International Committee during its meeting in Munich in May 1959.... An Association has been formed in Durban naming itself the South African Sports Association and this association, we understand, is making application for direct affiliation to the International Olympic Committee for recognition as a controlling body of sport throughout South Africa. The [South African National Olympic Committee] gives you an absolute assurance that this body is comprised of a half a dozen non-Europeans (mostly Indians) and they cannot possibly control sport in the union of South Africa. They are not organised to do, they have no facilities, and they would not, on any consideration whatsoever, be accepted by any of the South African Governing Bodies of Sport in this country.... Here then is the crux of the whole position, where a few coloureds and Indians are endeavouring to upset the affiliation of the properly constituted Bantu Athletic Association. This resolution is indicative of the attitude being adopted by an International correspondent, Mr. Brutus, who is mentioned in the attached report and who has had direct correspondence with you.... No doubt it will be asked why non-European have not been accepted in International Teams from South Africa previously. The reason is that, in the first place, until 1957 none of the non-European Bodies, whose sport is on the Olympic programmes, had been properly constituted and controlled, and

individual non-European had no desire or wish to attend or to apply for membership of European clubs. It was only at the end of 1957/58 that any organised non-European association had applied for affiliation. Naturally, none of the South African Governing Bodies of Sport could accept applications from mushroom non-European bodies that were being formed, one in opposition to the other, as has so repeatedly been stated to you, it being extremely difficult for the non-European who is Bantu, Coloured or Indian to agree among themselves as to the control of their particular sport. Irrespective of what Mr. Brutus or the correspondent for the South Africa Sports Association, or the South African Amateur Athletic and Cycling Association, may state in a memorandum to you, the [South African National Olympic Committee], which has been affiliated to the International Olympic Committee for nearly forty years suggests that if any consideration whatsoever is given to the thought that non-Europeans could control the whole of the sport in South Africa, is ridiculous, and would be the complete end of international sport between South Africa and countries overseas.... Our Mr. Honey does not speak with a mandate from South Africa and will give his own views as a member of the International Olympic Committee, but in view of the fact that a few non-Europeans (not the South African native) but Coloured and Indians are forcing this issue, I am sure you will reason with Mr. Honey on this most difficult question.... Finally, the [South African National Olympic Committee] gives you an assurance that when the non-European amateur associations are properly constituted, and control the various section of non-Europeans' sport in South Africa, they will be accepted as affiliated members of the South African Governing Bodies of Sport. The assurance is also given that no obstacle will be placed in the way of any non-European competitor, in any event including the British Empire and Olympic Games, of taking part in these events if the controlling body nominates him to the [South African National Olympic Committee].⁵⁸

This statement marked the first mention of the South African Sports Association (SASA), which was a group trying to promote non-racial sport and defame SANOC. Emery immediately endeavoured to discredit it in order to protect SANOC from any challenges in respect of control of sport in South Africa. He pointed to Brutus as the cause of the continued fight against SANOC as the legitimate NOC. Emery, in customary fashion, again cited the lack of interest by non-white groups to partake in

Olympic programmes at least until 1957, and the lack of non-white organizations, as reasons for low or no non-white participation. The notion of non-whites controlling South African sport, in Emery's view, was ridiculous. He hoped his assertion that non-white amateur athletes would face no obstacles towards competing internationally, once proper affiliations were made to the South African Governing Bodies of Sport, would assure the IOC's cooperation.

The five-page attachment from SANOC on the subject of SANOC and non-European affiliations stated that SANOC's constitution, dating to 1920, did not exclude non-whites. The attachment's list of the South African Governing Bodies of Sport indicated that the only non-white associations interested in affiliation were weightlifting, athletics, cycling, boxing and football. SANOC described these sports in detail and provided updates on the status of the non-white affiliation process with regard to each association. It was clearly stated that there were no restrictions on non-white athletes to compete internationally if each respective sport were to form a national association representing all non-whites, which, in turn, would then be accepted by the NSFs, providing that all athletes were confirmed amateurs, and that the athletes involved achieved international standards.

To provide a specific detailed example of the affiliation process, Emery provided a copy of his correspondence with D.P.T. Payn, Secretary of the International Amateur Athletics Federation (IAAF).⁵⁹ Further, Emery confirmed the legitimacy of the South African Bantu Amateur Athletic and Cycling Association (SABAACA), which was an affiliated non-white member of the controlling bodies of athletics and cycling in South Africa. To provide proof of SABAACA's legitimacy, Emery included a letter from its

secretary, D.F. Botha⁶⁰ indicating SABAACA's acceptance of the terms of the South African Cycling and Athletic organizations. Botha stated: "We have been assured that when any of our athletes or cyclists reach the standard required for international competition that they will be included in South African teams selected for the Commonwealth Games and/or Olympic Games. My association is very pleased about this and we feel that this is a step forward in athletics and cycling among non-Whites in this country."⁶¹ Emery also attempted to warn Payn about the danger of, he argued, illegitimate and non-approved associations attempting to attain international recognition, again warning against Brutus' activities:

There is a certain Mr. Brutus of Port Elizabeth to whom reference is made in the memorandum of the Olympic Games Association and who is causing a considerable amount of annoyance in South Africa with his letters to International Federations on behalf of the non-Whites. I respectfully ask your Federation not to be misled by any of these mushroom associations which are being formed by non-Whites in this country, many for political reasons, but to know that the present South African Amateur Athletic Association controlled by Europeans and who have accepted the non-White South African Bantu Amateur Athletic and Cycling Association as an affiliated member, is the one body in South Africa in whom you can have the utmost faith in the promotion of athletics for both White and non-white people in this country.⁶²

It was obvious in his lengthy letter to Brundage that Emery was assuming ownership and control of the situation. He constantly provided Brundage with fodder to support SANOC's progress.

Emery also continued to provide material showing the disunity among non-white sporting bodies. For example, he sent two documents to Brundage highlighting a quarrel between SAAWBF and another representative from a seemingly false organization trying to affiliate with SANOC.⁶³ In addition, as SASA tried to become

more noticeable, Emery again attempted to discredit it, enlisting one Sol Cruste, who in *A Plea for Co-Ordination* on 1 May 1959, claimed that the SASA was not representative of non-European sporting bodies; a new sports co-ordinating body was recommended.⁶⁴ Emery advised Brundage that the letter from Cruste:

... makes it perfectly plain that the South African Sports Association, non-White, who have submitted a report to you, does not in fact exist. It has not been formed and is not representative of 0.001% of non-Europeans in South Africa ... I am sorry to have to give you all this trouble, but unless you have the true facts of the position regarding non-Europeans in South Africa and their endeavours to take control through a few political leaders, you or some of the Members of the international Olympic Committee at your previous meeting, may have been misled.⁶⁵

Brundage may have harboured doubts as to Cruste's authority to make such claims since his position – an unspecified association with a Vocational Training Centre – only appears at the bottom of the letter. There existed no additional correspondence to Brundage identifying Sol Cruste as a trustworthy and authoritative source.

Brundage was also kept apprised of the way the issue was received in the South African public. He received a copy of a letter sent to Otto Mayer from A.G. McKenzie, who was a representative of Johannesburg's daily *The Star*. In the letter, McKenzie thanked Mayer for the information on the proceedings of the IOC General Session in Munich, where the South African issue was formally discussed.⁶⁶ McKenzie also included *The Star* article in which Mayer's remarks were cited. The article stated that South Africa and Rhodesia would continue to be a part of Olympic Movement on the condition that each do everything possible to develop non-white sport. A lofty statement, perhaps, but it became clear that the IOC's patience in the matter was being sorely tried. For instance, Mayer was quoted: "In future the committee will maintain

a strict check on what has been promised by Mr. Reginald Honey.... If the committee has not taken action before, it is because the problem was not so important. Sport among the Coloured people of South Africa was not so developed as it is now.”⁶⁷ *The Star* article also focussed on South African IOC member Reginald Honey:

Mr. Honey’s defence of South Africa’s practices was two-fold: He said that the South Africa Olympic Games Association would encourage non-European sport and the non-Europeans would automatically be included in the South African teams if they reached Olympic standards.... The executive board asked Mr. Honey for a statement in view of the representations it had received from the South African Sports Federation (a mixed organization) and from the British-based campaign against race discrimination in sport and in view of the attack which Mr. Alexis Romanov one of the Russian delegates had made in Rome last week.... Mr. Honey said non-European sport had evolved slowly in South Africa and gave a formal assurance that South Africa complied strictly with the Olympic charter.... When Mr. Honey added that any non-European athletes who reached the required standards would be included in South African Olympic teams, Mr. Brundage asked whether they would get visas to leave the Union.... Yes, replied Mr. Honey. He had recently had an assurance to that effect from the Minister of the Interior.⁶⁸

Brundage accepted Honey’s assurance as the IOC could only request that the South African NOC find a solution in keeping with the *Olympic Charter*. By now the South African issue within the context of the Olympic Movement had escalated to a level where representatives from both sides began to issue public statements. Prior to the IOC making its public statement Mayer informed SANOC that the IOC wished to issue a statement to the press addressing the subject of racial discrimination in South Africa: “Before [issuing a statement] we wish to submit [to] you our text with the request that you let us know your approval or your eventual remarks as soon as possible.”⁶⁹ The IOC deferred to SANOC on the wording of this following proposed statement that addressed racial discrimination in South Africa:

... while [SANOC] does not control all South African bodies and therefore cannot dictate their policy, it is taking active steps to ensure them to accept the view that all peoples in South Africa are entitled to compete in international sport and particularly in the Olympic Games. It has made a public statement that if any non-white amateur athlete proves through tests that he is of international or Olympic standard, no objection will be raised to his being sent to take part in these over-sea competitions.... It has informed us that the government of South Africa will raise no objection to this problem, and that passports will be issued.... the N.O.C. of South Africa has informed us that they are proceeding to assist in providing training and coaching facilities and organization leadership to non-whites.⁷⁰

Indirectly addressing Mayer's letter, a frustrated Emery wrote to Brundage, indicating the increasing divergence of their opinions on this issue:

It is, of course, quite impossible for the [South African National Olympic Committee] to accept the affiliation from two separate Bodies, and the South African Sports Federation must now apply to the various South African Governing bodies of Sport for affiliation of their various sections. I am sure you will also realise that the South African Governing Bodies of Sport will not accept affiliation from any Association that is not properly constituted.⁷¹

Emery thus, in part, contradicted Mayer's press release, noting that it would not be easy for non-white amateur athletes to prove that they were of international or Olympic competition standard. Emery remained unmoved on the process of non-white associations first becoming affiliated with the respective NSFs recognized by SANOC, before being able to nominate non-white athletes for tryouts. From Emery's point of view, the IOC press statement was an oversimplification of the process, which would increase pressure on SANOC to admit those who were not prepared to compete on the international stage.

However, in his subsequent letter to Brundage, Emery provided an official update on SANOC's deliberations.⁷² At SANOC's meeting of 18 June 1959, Honey recounted

his meetings in Rome with NOCs, and with the IOC and ISFs in Munich. His message to them, assertively delivered, was that SANOC would not entertain the idea of two Olympic Games Associations in South Africa, and that SASA had been advised that non-white bodies of sport must affiliate to the South African Governing Bodies of Sport, which were, in turn, affiliated with ISFs. Further:

The [South African National Olympic Committee] has advised the South African Sports Association (non-white) that they cannot in future have any further dealings with this Association, as it has no say whatsoever in the selection of Teams for the Olympic Games, as these selections are made, as in all other countries, by the Governing Bodies of Sport concerned. My Association is quite confident that all people of South Africa will be given the opportunity of competing in international events overseas and as mentioned in the statement to be issued by the Chancellor of the International Olympic Committee any non-white who reaches the standard required by South Africa for sending a team to international sports will be sent.... My Association trusts that, in view of the assurance that we have now given, correspondence between the South African Sports Association or any non-white Association which refuses to accept affiliation by a recognised South African Governing Body of Sport which has been affiliated constitutionally to their International Sports Federation should be returned to South Africa.⁷³

But there was more. Emery, desiring to maintain strict control of sport in South Africa, reiterated this point with the IOC and the international community. In addition, to avoid any confusion, Emery clarified the selection process for South African teams:

The South African Governing Bodies of Sport, whose event figure on the Olympic or British Empire & Commonwealth Games programme conduct their own trials, and after these trials have been completed forward their nominations in order of merit to the South African Olympic and Commonwealth Games Association [SANOC]. My Association then deals with the nominations received and sends the Team according to the amount of money it has available for that purpose. If the occasion arises when the [South African National Olympic Committee] has not sufficient money to send the full team nominated by the various Governing Bodies of Sport, the teams nominated are cut but the order of merit is not changed. In fact if, for instance, the athletes nominated ten people and through lack of

funds the Olympic Council could not send the full team No. 10, 9 and 8, as the case may be, would be dropped. This instances what has not been made clear to the various Associations who attended the meeting in Rome and Munich by the people who opposed South Africa's continuance at the Games.⁷⁴

Prompted by continuing unrest on the issue, Emery invited Brundage to visit South Africa and see the situation for himself, "... you will be able to see more from your own personal observations than all the letters in the world can convey to you. It will be possible for you to meet the Non-European Association, if you so desire, and this invitation is sent with all our best wishes."⁷⁵ Brundage, however, declined the invitation, pointing out that his schedule prevented a visit at that time.⁷⁶ Since Brundage declined to visit South Africa at that time, Emery was left with reinforcing SANOC's position by continuing to repeat his arguments about the unpreparedness of non-whites for international competition. He sought to offer an example from cycling:

This information which we have given the International Cycling Federation, bears out conclusively the statement that we have repeatedly made to the International Olympic Committee, and confirmed at your meeting in Rome by your representative for South Africa, Mr. R. Honey, that the non-whites at the moment, are nowhere near the standard required for international competition.... You will also see that the promises made that South Africa would do all it could for non-white sports are being carried out.⁷⁷

To further embellish this example, Emery attached a letter he planned to send to the International Cycling Union.⁷⁸ In this letter, Emery provided an update of the Bantu Association's involvement in cycling competitions. He listed the finish times of the winners of the non-white competition and offered a comparison to the South African record. He pointed out that non-white athletes were far too behind international standards and far too inconsistent to be sent to the Olympics. SANOC's best interests, he stated, were to send competitors to represent South Africa who, at

the very least, reached international standard times. In closing, Emery reiterated SANOC's promise that if non-white South Africans could reach international standards, they would be allowed to compete overseas.

Emery's point of view insinuated that SANOC had done all it could to help integrate non-white athletes and better the sport situation in South Africa. He belaboured Brundage, asking him to read the letters written by SANOC to the International Amateur Boxing and Weightlifting Federations,⁷⁹ and the newspaper clippings of a cricket match between white and non-whites, as an example of SANOC's efforts to honour Honey's statements.⁸⁰ Yet not all news was positive from Emery's perspective, as evidenced by a personal and confidential letter to Brundage, with newspaper cuttings on a riot of 2000 mine-workers attached. Emery's patience appeared to be wearing thin:

... this again shows how difficult it would be to get this tribal difference sorted out if ever you demanded a competition of mixed races from South Africa at the Olympic Games.... We are doing our best to educate these non-whites to the standard of education and living which would warrant them being mixed with competitors from other nations at the Olympic Games, and when the time comes, and this has been successfully organised, South Africa will gladly consider discussing the matter again with the International Olympic Committee.⁸¹

Despite Emery's growing frustration, he stood firm on SANOC's place in the current IOC structure, standing firm against forces attempting to reconstruct the IOC and sport in South Africa on their own terms:

We have received circular letters from the Olympic Committee of the U.S.S.R., one dated 29th April 1959 and the other, 30th November, 1959 regarding their proposal for the alteration of the composition of the International Olympic Committee. This Matter will be discussed by my Executive on the 26th January and I will report to you the result of the discussions.... It is my own considered opinion

that Russia and the non-white countries are endeavouring to get control of the IOC and I do not think we will support the proposals.... P.S. South Africa still awaits your reply as to whether you and your good lady will visit us.⁸²

Brundage resumed the correspondence with some brief supportive remarks, some four months later,⁸³ and with the 1960 Rome Games on the horizon, Emery once again pleaded SANOC's case, now to IOC Chancellor Otto Mayer, seeking to separate sports from politics in a way that would confirm his argument:

... we are doing our utmost to get the non-whites organised so that whatever Association is formed, will represent all the non-whites in this country and not only one section. The South African Sports Association, as we told you before, does not and never will be able to represent the whole of the non-whites in South Africa, and it is for this reason we sincerely trust that your Committee will not grant such an interview as being asked for.... P.S. STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL: You no doubt have heard of the trouble going on in this country just at the moment, but might I assure you that all the amateur sports bodies in this country are completely non-political. We are doing our utmost to have our men properly trained and money raised to send them to Rome in 1960. I can assure you that none of us wish to be drawn into political arguments and we give the assurance that when the non-Whites are willing to co-operate with us in amateur sport devoid of all political reasons, we will be happy to meet them. It might not be long before such a state of affairs will come about.⁸⁴

Emery tried to paint SASA as a political body more so than a sporting body. If and when a non-white association might be formed legitimately, Emery opined, then the non-white community would be in the position of being taken seriously in the South African sporting community. It was clear whom Emery wished to be regarded as the main obstacle to progress towards a solution:

... the South African Sports Association was not so much interested in the organising of non-White sport, as they were with political matters.... The Action of the Security Police bears out this statement very completely, as no other non-White sports body has been screened, to our knowledge.... In view of the fact that Mr. Brutus has

again forwarded correspondence to the International Federation and others whom we do not know, these new developments should make it clearly understandable that the [South African National Olympic Committee], who is not concerned whatsoever in politics, cannot accept the affiliation of such a body as the South African Sports Association under the present conditions.... when the non-Whites form themselves into a sporting body and not a political body and represent the non-Whites in the country who are interested in sport, they would be affiliated to the various associations in this country.... when any non-White Association is properly constituted and represents the whole of the non-Whites, and not merely a section, they would be accepted as members of the associations concerned.... You will realise therefore, if the European Associations accept the wishes of the IOC and cut their teams to a minimum and to keep them within international standards, we cannot be expected to send non-White competitors whose performances are so far below those of the White competitors.... The [South African National Olympic Committee] has no dealings whatsoever in politics, and we are doing our utmost to see that the team which will take part in the 1960 Games is representative of all the branches of sports in which we take part in this country. Insofar as the non-Whites are concerned, the only sports which they take part in nationally, is athletics, cycling, weight-lifting, and boxing and all four of these sections are being given trials under the supervision of officials who have been accepted by the respective International Federations.... I am quite sure that the present position with the [South African] Sports Association is such that [South African National Olympic Committee] will be able to have far better dealings with the genuine non-White sports associations who are not tainted with any political motives.... I can say without hesitation, that if the South African Sports Association is disbanded for its political activities, non-White sport in this country will go ahead by leaps and bounds.⁸⁵

The article Emery attached detailed a police raid of the homes of SASA President Dennis Brutus, the secretary and the assistant secretary, resulting in the seizure of letters, pamphlets, and documents.⁸⁶ The article also noted that among Brutus' correspondents were Avery Brundage and Otto Mayer, President and Chancellor of the IOC, respectively.

In the face of non-white South African representation planned for the upcoming Games in Rome failing to materialize, Emery offered an explanation to Brundage from

the President of SABAACA stating that non-Whites could not reach the standards required for the Olympic Games.⁸⁷ This explanation was based on the performance at the cycling trials and athletics trials, trials presided over by both “European” and “non-European” officials. Since during these trials no non-white athlete met Olympic standards, no nominations for the South African Olympic team had occurred.⁸⁸ The President of SABAACA explained that they were trying to improve standards – he hoped for continued assistance and support from SANOC and the IOC in this regard. In Emery’s next letter to Brundage, he included reports from a non-white newspaper as proof that there was not a single non-white athlete near international standards in amateur boxing; however, progress was occurring:

You will see that the S.A. Athletic and Cycling Union is endeavouring to have a Coach imported to teach the Non-White Athletes. I am quite sure that this article should give you plenty of scope to squash any further attempts by our Mr. Brutus in this country, and other people in other countries who are waiting to have the policy discussed by the International Olympic Committee.⁸⁹

A month later, just before the 1960 Olympic Games opened in Rome, a seemingly exasperated Emery sent a note to Mayer concerning the difficulty of uniting the different coloured races: “This is only one of many instances [an enclosed newspaper article] where the opposing teams fight it out instead of playing it out. Only last week, the whole of one non-White football team was charged with the murder of three of the opposing players.... So much for Mr. Brutus saying that they have not been given the opportunity of competing.”⁹⁰ Mayer responded to Emery with congratulations on progress, while noting that complete resolution of the issue was still a long way off:

I am very pleased that the South African Rowing Federation has modified its rules and that no difference is now existing between White and coloured members. I informed Mr. Anthony Steel in

London about it. But I send him also the paper cutting showing the fight during a football match between non-whites and in presence of 27,000 non-White spectators!⁹¹

3. Domestic Resistance

G.R. Smith, Secretary of the SAAWBF, was the first person to write to Brundage about the South African race issue.⁹² On 11 November 1954, Smith requested information to help SAAWBF gain international recognition so its affiliated athletes might take part in world championships. In addition, Smith asked for Brundage's advice regarding the limited opportunities for non-white athletes:

In our country another body exists. This organisation caters for athletes with white skins only and you can see how many 'dark' skinned athletes are deprived from real chances. The other organisation has obtained international recognition but does not comply with the true aims of Physical Education. With this in mind, you will no doubt see the urgency of the appeal that we are lodging with you. We seek your expert advice on this matter.... We sincerely trust that you will be sympathetic towards our appeal, and trust that you will view it in the light of real Physical Education. We now look forward to you[r] comments which we trust will be received by us at your earliest possible convenience.⁹³

The "true aims of physical education" to which Smith referred were the "all-round development of all men, irrespective of colour, sex, or creed."⁹⁴ Brundage's response encouraged Smith and SAAWBF to write a similar letter to the ISF in France. Said Brundage: "For your information, so far as the Olympic Games are concerned, one of the fundamental principles is – 'no discrimination is allowed against any country or person on grounds of color, religion or politics'."⁹⁵ Brundage stood firm on Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter*, supporting those who strove for such an ideal.

The discussion between SAAWBF and the IOC continued intermittently. Almost two years later, on 1 October 1956, IOC Chancellor Mayer responded to a letter

received a month earlier from SAAWBF,⁹⁶ in which SAAWBF gave notice of its plan to apply for admission to the Olympic Games in Rome 1960. Mayer's response reiterated applicable rules and regulations and included the restatement that it must become a member of the NSF sponsored by SANOC. Thus, the IOC recused itself from consideration of the issue. The SAAWBF, stated Mayer, should confer with SANOC for further instruction. Over a year later, Brundage received a letter from Brutus with an attached copy of a report submitted by SAAWBF to K.S. Duncan, the Honorable Secretary of BECGF.⁹⁷ The key points of the report to Duncan were as follows:

With regard to our efforts for Olympic participation, we have been advised by one of the affiliates to the IOC that it is 'with us every inch of the way in your request for admission to the Olympic Games to be held in Rome in 1960'.... We applied to the South African Amateur Weightlifting Union and were advised 'no non-Europeans may affiliate to our Union'. In a further letter we were advised that: 'My Union has been in communication with the [South African National Olympic Committee] about the application for affiliation. As an association affiliated to the S.A.O.G.A [i.e., SANOC] we can naturally not amend our Constitution without its approval. However, the latter association has assured us that they are giving the matter immediate attention with a view to coming to an agreement which will suit everyone concerned'. On the 20th of this month, Press reports appeared of a decision taken on this matter at the Executive meeting of the SANOC and our Secretary has written requesting confirmation and clarification of reports that the Association has resolved not to admit any non-white sportsmen or sporting organizations to the SANOC ... We are still awaiting a full reply to our request for confirmation of statements attributed by the Press to Mr. Sims, Chairman of the SANOC on the 28th August.... While all Press reports agree that the SANOC has resolved to refuse membership to all non-white sport bodies in the country, divergent reasons are given as follows: (1) that the SANOC must maintain the policy of apartheid, not only because it is the policy of the present Government, but because it has always been the policy of the country; (2) that it is against the constitution of the SANOC; (3) that it is contrary to the laws of the country for Europeans and non-Europeans to take part in competitive sport together and it was therefore impossible for the Association to sanction such competition.... It is reported that a memorandum is to be drawn up either by the Secretary or by a

committee, its purpose being reported variously to be (a) to explain the policy of apartheid in sport, (b) to explain the section in the constitution which excludes non-whites and (c) to explain the laws which forbid competitive sport between white and non-white.... We have written to the SANOC asking 'would you kindly let us know what we must do now to have our sportsmen represented', as we felt that this flat refusal can hardly be regarded as the 'agreement to suit everyone concerned' which we were promised.... We have also queried other statements attributed to Mr. Sims, viz.: 1. If international sporting associations decide to penalize us because of our stand, it will be just too bad: 2. If one sporting association should lose international recognition as a result of this stand, then the SANOC would withdraw all the other sporting bodies it embraced: 3. That the non-whites are not prepared to accept white representatives in their controlling bodies; 4. That the non-whites do not want help but status.⁹⁸

Brutus' letter casted doubt on Emery's interpretation of sport in South Africa. Further, although Brutus went to some length to explain that the statements given by SAAWU to justify the exclusion of non-whites were complete nonsense, Brundage was both brief and curt in his initial response to Brutus: "We shall no doubt hear from the South African Olympic Association on this subject in due time."⁹⁹ Brundage, seemingly unperturbed, was apparently satisfied by his discussion with SANOC. A month later, Brutus wrote to Brundage for clarification relative to his (Brundage) communication with SANOC:

My Federation is a little puzzled by your statement: We shall no doubt hear from the South African Olympic Association on this subject in due time. We have been negotiating with the South African Olympic and Commonwealth Games Association [SANOC] since August of 1956 and we would like to know if they have not advised the International Olympic Committee of our attempts to secure recognition.... We have also the precaution of advising the Chancellor, M. Otto Mayer, of our efforts and we trust that they will be given due attention.¹⁰⁰

Despite not receiving response from Brundage or the IOC for a further two months, Brutus continued to look to the IOC for guidance and support. In a letter to Brundage in April 1958, he noted:

Further to our inquiry whether the matter of our efforts to secure international recognition had not been previously discussed by the International Olympic Committee, I have to inform you that inquiries have also been directed to the South African Olympic and Commonwealth Games committee, and to the Chancellor of the IOC, M. Otto Mayer.... Since we were informed on the 23rd December by M. Gouleau of the International Weightlifting Federation that it was a matter for the International Olympic Committee, we are very anxious to have the matter discussed. Could you please advise us whether it will be possible to have the matter raised at the May meeting of the Congress in Tokyo? ... We would also appreciate advice on how to act in this matter.¹⁰¹

Brutus and SAAWBF, having tried without success to communicate with various sources on their plight, and generally ignored regarding the matter of international recognition, conducted a turn towards the IOC. However, when Brundage finally responded two weeks later, he only noted: "We do not intervene in national affairs unless our regulations are violated. We have asked our representatives in South Africa for a report. The situation will be re-examined when that report is received."¹⁰² Brundage's response appeared to be at odds with Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter* and, as we have seen in the earlier section of this chapter, Brundage discussed Article 1 with Emery as early as February 1956.¹⁰³ Obviously, Brundage was stalling, trying to buy time for SANOC as a courtesy for its long history with the IOC and its assurances of trying to right the race situation.

Emery wrote to G.R. Smith to expedite the non-white inclusion process:

... every South African Governing Body of Sport affiliated to the [South African National Olympic Committee] has had the courtesy to send us the names and addresses of the Chairman and Secretaries of

their Associations together with Clubs affiliated to their Provincial Bodies. There seems little reason why we cannot receive this information from you and for which we have asked repeatedly.¹⁰⁴

Emery also mentioned that the proper authorities had been advised in regard to SAAWBF requesting affiliation, but that the necessary information to be considered for admission to SANOC had not been provided. Emery did, however, notify Brundage of receiving the pertinent information needed from SAAWBF.¹⁰⁵ In the same letter, Emery queried Brundage on a report he (Brundage) was supposedly awaiting from SANOC, while days before, Brutus had asked about the same report: "My federation is anxious to know whether the report has been received," wrote Brutus, "whether its contents will be made available to us, and whether any decision has been taken by the International Olympic Committee."¹⁰⁶

Regardless of the existence of a report, Brutus provided a copy of an extremely detailed letter submitted to the weightlifting ISF to provide further support for SAAWBF's application for membership.¹⁰⁷ This focussed Brundage's attention to the issue. In his next letter to SAAWBF, he asserted that a report was being developed, but that it would take some time because of the complicated nature of the issue:

In reply to your letter of September 8, as we advised you previously, we requested a report from the South African [National] Olympic Committee on the situation in your country. We have just recently heard from this organization that the situation is a very complicated one, with a number of different groups seeking recognition. We have been assured that they are continuing to study this involved problem and endeavoring to find a solution in line with Olympic regulations.... In any event, the International Olympic Committee does not recognise national organizations other than National Olympic Committees.¹⁰⁸

This statement is important because here Brundage reasserted the structure and processes of the IOC in no uncertain terms. Veiled in his words was a polite request to

stop writing the IOC directly and funnel its information through SANOC. Ignoring this advice, Brutus continued to keep Brundage updated. Brutus, it became obvious, and not without reason, did not trust SANOC. Brutus notified Brundage of a round table conference organized by SAAWBF for national sporting organizations to take place on 5 October 1958 to discuss the entire issue of non-white sport in South Africa.¹⁰⁹

The round table conference did indeed take place. Following the conference, Emery reminded G.R. Smith that SAAWBF could not request affiliation to any international bodies because SAAWU already represented South Africa. SANOC could not compel any association to accept affiliation, but if SAAWU accepted the provincial branches of the SAAWBF, SANOC would have no objection.¹¹⁰ The assurances mentioned by Emery and his request for patience notwithstanding, Smith was not content, as became evident in a letter to Brundage:

While my Federation agrees completely that the situation is very complicated, we are not satisfied that the S.A. Olympic Committee is truly 'endeavouring to find a solution in line with Olympic regulations' and we will continue to press for a full examination of the position by the International Olympic Committee.... We note that a report has been sent to the International Olympic Committee by the S.A. Olympic and Commonwealth Games Association, and are anxious to have a copy of this. We are thus applying to the SANOC for it and failing that, must request the International Olympic Committee to furnish us with a copy. A copy of our request for this report is enclosed for your information.... It was also agreed at our Annual General Meeting in East London that a report of the position should be submitted by our Federation, and this will be forwarded in due course.¹¹¹

In his letter requesting information from SANOC, which was included with his letter to Brundage, Smith continued to seek the answers: "... there are three important points requiring clarification: a. 'a number of different groups are seeking recognition' b. 'that they are continuing to study this involved problem' c. that they are

‘endeavouring to find a solution in line with Olympic regulations’ ... Could you please enlighten us on these points? If necessary we are prepared to send a representative to Johannesburg.”¹¹² The confidence displayed by the SAAWBF in this missive was surprising, the requests are expressed in a bold, firm, and, at times, seemingly overbearing manner.

On the subject of rising domestic resistance, Brundage received official word of the new organization – South African Sports Association (SASA). It came from the Secretary of SASA’s steering committee, R.S. Govender: “The South African Sports Association, a newly formed organisation representing every major Non-White Sports Body in the country, is holding a National Sports Conference in Durban on the 10th and 11th January, 1959, for the purpose of co-ordinating the work of different sports codes in an effort for international recognition.”¹¹³

A month later, Brundage responded to Govender:

... I note that the South African Sports Association has been organized to endeavor to find a solution to the problems existing in your country... So far as Olympic rules are concerned, there can be only one National Olympic Committee in a country and it should include all the National Federations which are members of the International Federations which govern sports on the Olympic program.¹¹⁴

Brundage stood firm and consistent. His message to Govender enunciated the IOC structure and its rules. However, when Brundage sent a copy to Mayer, he added a notation: “There should be something in our rules to indicate that there can be only one NOC in a country. This is something we have overlooked.”¹¹⁵ This note revealed that sports organizations might have been led to assume that more than one NOC per

country could exist within the IOC, so clarification in the IOC rules was needed to rectify this confusion.

Two weeks later, Brutus provided an update to Brundage regarding SASA:

The South African Sports Association will be taking up the matter of international recognition actively, in addition to its internal work of co-ordinating the work of the National Sports Federation in South Africa. As you are aware, the South African Olympic and Commonwealth Association which might do this work, excludes non-white South Africans.... The SASA is already supported by ten national non-racial sporting bodies and we expect the number to increase in the near future.¹¹⁶

Brutus and the SASA were forcing the issue of international recognition with an organization, the IOC, which already recognized a national body. For the SASA to become the official body representing South Africa, first, SANOC would have to be expelled, and second, SASA had to be accepted by the IOC. Brutus' letter to Brundage included a copy of a letter sent to Mayer. The letter to Mayer stated the resolutions adopted at the conference on national non-racial sporting bodies. Each of the National Sports Federations supporting the conference was seeking international recognition. Brutus directed Mayer's, and in turn, Brundage's, attention to Resolutions 5 and 6, which fell within the purview of the IOC:

Resolution No. 5 – In view of the fact that the International Olympic Committee has called for a report in the South African situation, the South African Sports Association resolves to submit a comprehensive memorandum on the subject and calls on all National Sports Federation to supply relevant data for inclusion in the memorandum.

Resolution No. 6 – This Conference of the South African Sports Association believes that it is the inherent right of every South African to compete on merit for the right to represent South Africa in international sport and calls on all organisations controlling international sports to afford representation only to bodies truly representative of all South Africans.¹¹⁷

In the letter to Mayer, Brutus also summarized SASA's aims and motivations:

It is the attention not only of the IOC but of all international bodies which we desire, and we will therefore be sending copies of the resolutions to all international bodies ... We hope to have the memorandum ready well in advance of the next congress of the IOC and will also circulate it to your affiliates. We trust that you will give it due consideration and that you will be prepared to interest yourself in our plight and that the IOC will grant us the redress we are not able to find anywhere else.¹¹⁸

In Brundage's subsequent response to Brutus and the SASA, he remained factual.

At the bottom of the letter, attached to Mayer's copy, was a note to obtain more information and to reiterate that the organizations supporting the SASA remained in question:

Referring to the letter addressed to you by this Organization under date of January 23, I suggest that you write and ask them how many organizations belong to the various Federations, Associations and Unions mentioned, how many individual members each one of them has and what activities they have promoted and who participated. You might also point out that the organizations which are mentioned can have no direct connection with the International Olympic Committee, although we shall appreciate information on their activities.¹¹⁹

Shortly after Brundage sent his remarks to Brutus, Emery informed Brundage of the continued difficulties caused by Brutus.¹²⁰ To advance from "no representation" to "equal representation" was a bold move, but to gain equal control right away may have been unrealistic.

In the context of this negative news, Brundage received another letter from Brutus, providing additional information: "I am enclosing clippings relating to the work of the Sports Association. The Minutes of our Conference will be sent to you as soon as they are available.... We will arrange to keep you fully informed of our activities and thank you for your interest."¹²¹ In like manner, Brutus responded to Mayer's 10 February

letter, in which he provided information on SASA, mentioning a membership of over 70,000 and the support from ten national bodies.¹²² All the national bodies, stated Brutus, staged national events every year – some had been in existence for five years, many more than ten. “Most of these bodies consist of various provincial units drawn from the provinces of South Africa, but it is the policy of the South African Sports Association to offer membership only to the parent national bodies, and only to bodies which are opposed to racial discrimination and are working for its removal.”¹²³ Brutus concluded his letter by assuring Mayer that a comprehensive memorandum of the facts and figures would be sent, as well as the SASA constitution, then under preparation.

The flow of information from SASA persisted. A statement by SASA President G.K. Rangasamy was sent to Brundage.¹²⁴ The statement noted Mayer mentioning that the IOC would discuss South Africa’s colour bar issue at the next meeting, focussing on Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter*. As welcome as that information was, three important goals remained for SASA:

1. All national bodies must stand together in this fight and help to present a full case to the IOC on our position.
2. We must expose misleading statements such as that of the Chairman of the South African Olympic Association, Gen. Klopper, that subservient affiliation is as good as full recognition.
3. We must fight against attempts to make us accept racial discrimination in sport, and against its acceptance by the South African Cricket Board of Control.¹²⁵

This strong language marked a rising confidence and commitment by SASA to strive for more equal representation in South African sports. SASA continued to press its case, sending a letter to Mayer, which included an abridged copy of the

memorandum to be submitted to the IOC. A full version of this memorandum would also be distributed to many countries affiliated with the IOC before the May 1959 meeting in Munich. A final remark by Brutus re-enunciated a desire to be present at such time as the IOC debated the South African issue:

I am aware that much of the material sent does not fall within the jurisdiction of your Committee, but we are anxious to present a full picture of the situation in our country and of our activities, in order to avoid being wrongly represented or reported.... Please advise me at the earliest convenient time if it will be possible for an observer or spokesman to attend the meeting on behalf of the South African sportsmen who are at present excluded from participation at the Olympic Games.¹²⁶

Brutus' request was denied. As a rationale for denial, Mayer noted that recommendations must first be made by the Executive Board to the General Session.¹²⁷ Brutus persisted nevertheless. Though expressing appreciation for Brundage's interest in upholding the principles of the Olympic Games and his willingness to discuss the problem, Brutus attempted to summarize the issue into one core issue:

We believe that basically our problem is a simple one: the prejudice of sports administrators being expressed in a colour-bar in sport without the justification of law, tradition or the wishes of sportsmen generally. But this simple issue is so obscured by other, secondary issues, that it is extremely difficult to discuss it fully and fairly. It is for this reason that we have applied to the International Olympic Committee for permission to have a representative or observer at the Munich meeting.¹²⁸

By this point the racial situation in South Africa had become well known in international circles, prompting Brutus to pursue a South African "presence" at future IOC meetings on the issue, which he conveyed to both Brundage and Otto Mayer:

I must point out that with the exception of two very small sections in Soccer and Athletics, the 10 million non-whites of South Africa are

completely without representation on the International Olympic Committee and no accurate account of their plight or of their activities can be given in the absence of a spokesman on their behalf. I realize that the International Olympic Committee can only deal with recognised national Olympic Committees, but it is hoped that this will be treated as a special case, because of the special circumstances, and that your Executive will agree to someone speaking on behalf of the non-white South Africans when the matter comes up for discussion.¹²⁹

Brutus concluded his request for “special consideration” by asking that Mayer send a message by cable once the Executive Board had reached a decision on this request to admit a representative to speak on behalf of the non-white community in South Africa at the next IOC General Session in Munich. Again, Mayer responded negatively, informing Brutus that it was not necessary to send an observer or spokesman since the whole problem first had to be discussed by the IOC Executive Board.¹³⁰

Brutus and the SASA were not without international supporters in their struggle to gain recognition. For instance, Mayer responded to a letter from Antony Steel, Secretary of an organization based in London, England, called the Campaign Against Race Discrimination in Sport (CARDS), telling him in no uncertain terms not “... to send an observer or a representative to our Munich meeting, as this problem has first to be discussed at our Executive Board meeting. Therefore please don’t take the trouble to send a Member of the British Parliament to attend on [SASA’s] behalf.”¹³¹ Dealing with SASA did not only fall to Mayer alone, Brundage, too, became immersed in the issue. Brutus provided Brundage with an advance abridged copy of the memorandum SASA proposed to submit for consideration at the Executive Board meetings in Rome as well as the Munich General Session scheduled for 23 May. Brutus

noted: "It will give a fair idea of the nature of our case, and the manner in which we will present it."¹³²

Brutus' persistence translated to mounting annoyance for the IOC administration. First, Mayer told Brutus, once more: "As I told you already in my last letter that problem will be studied by our Executive Board in Munich and not in Rome.... With reference to my last letter I wish to confirm that it is not necessary that you send your representative to Munich."¹³³ Brundage, likewise, adopted a stern stance with Brutus, telling him bluntly:

I think it is safe to say that the International Olympic Committee is not going to deviate from its fundamental principle that there shall be no discrimination against any country or person on grounds of race, religion or politics. This must be done, however, within the framework of our rules and regulations, without altering the structure of international sport, which is already complicated ... It is not necessary for you to send a representative to Munich. In any event, the meetings of the International Olympic Committee are closed. We hope to be able to solve this thorny problem insofar as the Olympic Movement is concerned with justice to all.¹³⁴

Since SASA was denied a representative at the forthcoming IOC general meeting, it decided to release a circular to affiliates, sporting bodies, and all interested persons:

The decision of the International Olympic Committee earlier this year, to examine the question of the colour-bar in South African sport, was hailed by SASA as the beginning of the most decisive phase in the fight for international recognition of all South Africans in sport.... The submission of a Memorandum to the IOC by SASA has taken the fight a step further, and it will serve as the basis for discussion in the period of controversy and debate which now probably lies ahead before we reach our ultimate goal.... It is expected that the IOC will not give a decision at this stage – its machinery is too immense for speedy action – but that it will give the closest attention to the South African problem in the coming months before the Olympic Games at Rome in August of next year....¹³⁵

This circular pressed the IOC to discuss and if possible solve the South African sport issue in the immediate future, rather than stalling indefinitely.

The IOC was not the only organization confronted by SASA. To hold those in charge of South African sport true to their expressed goals, Brutus sent a follow-up letter to Emery on behalf of the bodies representing SASA, "... I was directed to advise you that the SASA welcomes the recent assurance by Mr. Reg. Honey, President of the S.A.O.B.E.&C.G.A. that non-whites will be considered for selection in South African teams at the Olympic Games if they prove themselves fit for selection."¹³⁶

Furthermore, Brutus asked for assurance on a variety of points:

1. What method will be used when considering them for selection?
2. Will it be necessary for such candidates to be members of your affiliated national bodies?
3. What will be the position if it is not possible for them to be affiliated to one of the national bodies because of clauses excluding them from membership?
4. Will membership be granted only to such candidates, or will it be granted to other non-whites participating in the code of sport concerned?¹³⁷

A day later, before receiving a response from SANOC, SASA released another statement:

SASA expresses its appreciation to the IOC for considering the question of racialism in South African sport. The outcome of the discussions of the International Olympic Committee is hailed by SASA as a signal victory in the fight for true non-racialistic sport in our country.... SASA would have been content if the IOC had merely consented to inquire into the position. Instead, our South African administrators have been served due warning, through the IOC Resolution, that the position will be closely watched, and racial discrimination will not be tolerated or countenanced in the Olympic Games.... To those like Mr. Reg Honey who have told the world that there is no racial discrimination in Springbok teams, there is nothing

SASA can say: we must leave them to try and reconcile their consciences with the facts. To those who have been excluded by racial discrimination in the past, SASA has two things to say: Do not be deluded that entry into non-racial sport will be easy; a period of delicate and difficult negotiation lies ahead, in which it will be necessary to stand firm, and not to be duped into accepting inferior or unequal status.... The way is clear for non-white sportsmen to stake a bold claim, on merit, for inclusion in teams representing our entire country. Only merit will count, and it is up to them to make resolute efforts to prove their worth.... The glittering prize of international honours, in equal competition with the best in the world, is now within their grasp.¹³⁸

This statement publicly praised the IOC for at least taking note of the issue of racism in South African sports, challenged the current South African sport bodies and administrators to hold true to their words, and encouraged non-white athletes to take advantage of the opportunities to compete while keeping expectations reasonable.

After SASA publicly claimed its stake in the fight for equality in South African sport, Brutus attempted to be civil and cordial when asking Emery whether it would be possible for SASA to arrange a meeting with Brundage or hosting him during a visit to South Africa.¹³⁹ In a letter to Brundage, Brutus extended an invitation by SASA to welcome Brundage as its guest during his visit, paying careful attention to the value of his visit: "It is our considered opinion that it will only be possible for you to form a complete picture of the situation in sport in our country after you have met representatives of various sporting bodies, many of whom have been unable, up to now, to secure membership of the national Olympic Association."¹⁴⁰

Unfortunately for Brutus and SASA, Brundage replied that he had no plans to visit, but when he would, he would be happy to meet with representatives.¹⁴¹ In anticipation of the upcoming Munich General Session, Brutus also asked to arrange a

meeting between SASA officials and SANOC executive members in the near future to discuss the session in Munich.

Some five months later, as related by Brutus to Brundage, the friendly overtones to SANOC had fallen on deaf ears. A thoroughly frustrated Brutus cabled Brundage, reporting no change in the racial discrimination and sporting practices in South Africa:

In the name of Olympic ideals fair play and sportsmanship urgently request IOC direct attention to continued racial discrimination in South African sport despite assurances Rome May 1959. Racial discrimination in affiliation and trials being imposed though not legally required. Entreat remedial or disciplinary action before Rome Olympics.¹⁴²

Not receiving any response from the IOC for two months, Brutus on 13 April 1960 again pleaded with Brundage to draw attention to the South African issue by discussing it at the next meeting and allow a spokesman on behalf of the non-white population to present its case:

The South African Sports [A]ssociation formally requests, on behalf of the thousands of non-white South Africans who are excluded from the national sport of their country on grounds of race, that the Congress of the International Olympic Committee consent to discuss this issue and that permission be granted to a spokesman to present the case on behalf of these sportsmen.... You are doubtless aware that a considerable mass of information has already been submitted and is in the hands of the Chancellor of the IOC, M. Otto Mayer. Since the meetings in Rome and Munich last year, there has been further evidence of the determination of the administrators of the nationally recognized bodies in South African to exclude sportsmen on racial grounds, or to admit them under conditions which would preserve the racial structure of sport in South Africa contrary to the principles of the International Olympic Committee.¹⁴³

Brutus, in some exasperation, even reached out to Reginald Honey for help. SAAWBF and SAAWU had reached a deadlock in negotiations and Brutus attempted to enlist Honey's assistance:

... we are anxious that non-white weightlifters should be considered for the national representative team to take part in the forthcoming Olympics at Rome.... The South African Amateur Weightlifting Union is only prepared to permit this if we agree to affiliate to them on conditions which are racially discriminatory and which are contrary to the principles of the IOC, that is, that we should agree to be a subservient body, racially segregated from them, unequally represented in comparison with the white unions (provincial) which are affiliated to them, and that we should only be represented on their national council by white South Africans. This is blatant racial discrimination, to which the IOC is strongly opposed, and we must therefore ask you to interest yourself in the matter.... we have indicated to the S.A.A.W.U. that we are perfectly willing to work with them on condition that we are not forced to affiliate under conditions of racial discrimination: to this offer there has not yet been a reply.... I must point out that we had hoped to have some information and assistance from the South African Olympic and Commonwealth Games Association [i.e., SANOC] on this issue: so far none has been forthcoming.¹⁴⁴

To this plea, Brutus attached a letter to C. Oehley, Chairman of SAAWU, which contained a detailed account of the discussion between the two weightlifting associations.¹⁴⁵ It was evident that Brutus and SAAWBF were at an impasse, due mainly to the fact that SAAWBF refused to be treated as inferior to SAAWU and its members. Through a later SASA statement, it became obvious that Honey did not wish to become involved in the weightlifting quarrel.¹⁴⁶

In a reply to the 13 April 1960 letter, meanwhile, Brundage reaffirmed to Brutus where the IOC's allegiances lay:

... the International Olympic Committee is concerned solely with Olympic affairs and we have been assured by the South African Olympic and Commonwealth Games Association [i.e., SANOC], which we recognize, that no citizens of South Africa of Olympic calibre will

be barred from the South African team by reason of race, religion or political affiliations. Since this is in conformity with Olympic regulation, we see no purpose in a conference such as you suggest.¹⁴⁷

Adhering to the status quo, Brundage leveraged IOC rules, supporting SANOC based on its assurances. Although societal racial discrimination that hindered non-white sporting success was beyond the control of SANOC, it was clear that Brundage knew what governmental and sport institutional obstacles SANOC could overcome to include non-whites on the South African team. Brundage trusted that SANOC would do everything it could to remove the racial barriers for non-white inclusion.

Confirming what Brundage had been informed of in an earlier letter from Emery,¹⁴⁸ SASA finally released a statement detailing the police raids on the homes of SASA's President, secretary, and assistant secretary.¹⁴⁹ This act, though not proof of a SANOC violation of Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter*, did, however, send conflicting messages of how Brundage and the IOC should handle the South African situation. In its "released statement," the resilient, determined, and obstinate SASA announced 10 observations to help their case.¹⁵⁰ Though the SASA announcement displayed a collection of acknowledgements, sent letters and appeals, and notes of rejection, ultimately, the IOC recognized SANOC, not SASA, as South Africa's Olympic representative. Despite assurances made to the IOC by SANOC, Brutus continued his focussed attack: "... we have fresh evidence that racial discrimination was practised in the selection of the South African Olympic team. It is this evidence we wish to present for discussion by your Committee. Further the South African representative of the IOC, Mr. Reg. Honey, has gone on record, in an official interview with the London

'New Statesman,' as defending racial discrimination at present existing in South African sport."¹⁵¹

Some two months following Brutus' last letter to Brundage, G.K. Rangasamy formally charged SANOC of violating the *Olympic Charter* because of the racial discrimination in South African sport.¹⁵² Rangasamy assured that non-racial trials were not conducted to determine the composition of the South African Olympic team and non-white organizations had to accept racial discrimination as a condition to affiliate with the white dominated national bodies.

In the same letter to Brundage, Rangasamy made a request to put these charges on the agenda of the IOC meeting in Rome, and for SANOC to answer the charge. He also requested the opportunity to submit evidence, as well as a representative to be permitted to attend. The "charges" laid against SANOC by SASA appear in complete contradiction to the progress stated by Emery in his correspondence with the IOC. Brutus, in an effort to uphold Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter*, extended SASA's position in the fight for the removal of racial discrimination in South African sport. Brutus formally charged SANOC with practising racial discrimination. He also wanted SASA representatives at the next IOC meeting and he pointed out that in spite of the assurances given in Rome that discrimination was not practiced by SANOC, discrimination continued in South Africa.¹⁵³ A week later, a SASA statement from Brutus indicated that Rangasamy and Brutus, desiring to go to Rome to attend the IOC meeting, had their applications for passports denied.¹⁵⁴ At that point, an appeal was sent to all the countries affiliated with the IOC for assistance to achieve representation.

Since Rangasamy and Brutus were prevented from attending the IOC meeting in Rome, Rev. Michael Scott was chosen to speak on behalf of SASA and CARDS. Before addressing Olympic officials, Scott wrote to Brundage, hoping for a meeting to discuss the issue.¹⁵⁵ However, there is no record of a Scott - Brundage meeting. Nonetheless, in the address presented to the International Olympic Games Committee in Rome August 1960, Scott did indeed mention that Brutus was unable to attend because of the refusal to issue a passport to him.¹⁵⁶ Scott went on to note the absence of free competition, the unequal conditions of competition, and the lack of facilities for non-white athletes. He cited examples from boxing and weightlifting, identifying non-white athletes who could not qualify for the Rome Games even though they performed better than white athletes. SANOC, Scott argued, remained in breach of Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter*, despite Honey's assurances that no athlete of Olympic calibre would be excluded from the South African team. Competition was not open to all members unless one was affiliated with the South African national sport bodies that, unfortunately, operated a colour bar.¹⁵⁷

This statement by Scott on behalf of SASA and CARDS claimed to expose as farce the actions of Honey and SANOC. SASA and CARDS demanded action – a ban of the South African team. A dictum was issued directly before the 1960 Rome Olympic Games. A lack of support for SASA's and CARDS' position resulted in SANOC not being banned from the Games.

What other support did SASA have in its battle against SANOC? One measure of support came from international activists and organizations. I now turn to an

examination of their activities, through the lens of Avery Brundage's correspondence and his view of these developments.

4. International Community

Avery Brundage's concern relative to the South African issue was evident from the correspondence with SANOC and SASA. However, it was questionable whether Brundage's concerns about the negative publicity of the international voice and pressure really affected how he perceived and dealt with the South African situation. Nonetheless, the first international inquiry into the South African issue from a party not directly involved in the primary discussion about the South African race issue came from Olaf Ditlev-Simonsen, the IOC member from Norway. At the end of October 1956, before the Melbourne Games, Ditlev-Simonsen requested more information on the South African issue. He sent Otto Mayer a detailed letter, providing an impression of the public climate in Norway on the issue: "The Norwegian papers are very strongly stating that they think the IOC ought to take steps towards the South African National Olympic Committee to prevent them from excluding 'black people' from their sport associations and thus exclude them from taking part in the Olympic Games."¹⁵⁸

Two months later, Mayer sent a response, attributing the IOC's slow pace in dealing with this matter to the South African government's political prerogatives:

As regard to the South African situation concerning the exclusion of coloured people from the selection of their Olympic Team, I must say that the IOC, and especially our President Mr. Avery Brundage, has lengthily dealt with this matter. It has been given us to understand that this was a question concerning an internal Government's question in which the IOC should not be mixed in ... the Laws of a country cannot be altered by the IOC – Mr. Brundage has had long correspondence with South Africa in this matter and I wish you

would inform the Norwegian Press that up to now we have not been successful.¹⁵⁹

This is the first time that a response from an IOC representative identifies the South African government as the responsible party, as well as being a clear expression of the IOC's stance of non-involvement in political and domestic matters. Further, in the same letter, Mayer noted what the IOC's position would be:

I proposed to our President to exclude the South African [National] Olympic Committee unless it recognizes our rules which are absolutely clear on this subject: 'no discrimination of race'. We have done so for Argentine, Puerto-Rico and Cuba while the Governments of those countries wanted to interfere in the Olympic affairs of those resp. countries. Why should we not do the same for South Africa? But, as we cannot control the legislation of every country, the attention of the legislator should be drawn to the necessity of modifying certain laws, so that they may conform to the principles that we are defending. In suspending the South African [National] Olympic Committee are we going to change the situation? I am afraid not. We shall only stop those athletes for taking part in the Games. I quite agree with your point of view and I think an action should be taken. Therefore I shall inform Mr. Brundage about it, with copy of this letter, asking him to bring the matter on discussion at our Melbourne Session.¹⁶⁰

Mayer did have a different interpretation than Brundage as to how to deal with South Africa. He did not want to become involved in a country's domestic politics, but SANOC had to discover a way to separate it from government policies imposing apartheid.

As discussed in Chapter 1, Brundage had been accused of anti-Semitic and anti-black biases. More than ever, in dealing with the South African issue at this juncture, Brundage had to maintain a non-discrimination stance, both personally and as the head of the IOC. One example of his concern for the IOC's public profile during this time was Brundage's demonstrated desire for Olympic growth in Africa. In response

to a letter from the Secretary-General of the Milo Academy of Health and Strength mentioning plans to organize a Pan-African Amateur Sport Federation in order to hold a Pan-African Games every four years,¹⁶¹ Brundage exuded optimism. Also, Brundage sought to secure the influence of the Olympic Movement in these developments: "I note that you hope to be able to hold Pan-African Games. We observe that there is a great and growing interest in international competition and the Olympic Movement in African countries. You should consult with the National Olympic Committees in the countries involved."¹⁶² Furthering the growth of the Olympic Movement in African countries was of strategic importance for the IOC, faced, as it was, with international criticism of its stance on the South African issue.

Letters from the public and concerned groups began to arrive at the IOC. The first of many such letters, forwarded to Brundage by Mayer, was from Wales sent on behalf of 1100 Welsh people.¹⁶³ The author appreciated that the IOC was abiding by its rules and organizational structure in regard to the South African issue. However, due to such a governing sport system, the IOC had been limited to ensure that South Africa fielded a team representative of its population. This letter was indicative of an increasing international public and critical awareness of South African issue and the IOC's position, that the IOC could not fail but to take notice of – the author ultimately wanted the IOC to take the lead in this issue and either force SANOC to make necessary changes or expel it from the Olympic Movement.

In a similar vein, and of potentially greater concern to the IOC, it did not take long for an organization in the United States to contact Brundage on the South African issue, indeed making reference to the intervention originating from Wales. John

Williams, Director of Information of the American Committee on Africa (ACA), wrote a letter to Brundage on 22 April 1958 upon ACA having been notified that non-white weightlifters would not be considered by SANOC for the 1960 Games because of their race.¹⁶⁴ He reminded Brundage that the apartheid laws in South Africa forbade racial mixing. Williams was also aware of the campaign in Wales to ban South Africa from the Commonwealth Games and, furthermore, reiterated the belief that the IOC had to take a stand to influence the abolition of racial discrimination in South Africa. However, Williams' plea did little to influence Brundage's position of playing for time: "The situation in South Africa has been referred to us, and while we do not intervene in national affairs unless our regulations are violated, we have asked our representatives in that country to investigate and report to us."¹⁶⁵

Much later, Brundage was once again reminded of the international voice on the South African issue. In a letter from Lord Hemingford of The Africa Bureau, the following was noted:

Knowing that the International Olympic Committee upholds the principle that there should be no discrimination on grounds of race among the members of the teams representing the various countries, I am writing to ask that you consider at your meeting in May the firm application of this principle. I have the case of the Union of South Africa particularly in mind and trust that you will no longer regard this as a domestic matter for the South African branch....¹⁶⁶

The international message remained consistent – enforce Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter* and examine the entire issue at the next IOC session. In his response to Hemingford, Brundage again provided his stock answer:

... [I] can safely assure you that the International Olympic Committee has no intention of deviating from its fundamental principle that there shall be no discrimination against any country or person on grounds of race, religion or politics.... However, this problem in

South Africa is a most complicated one and not easy to solve with justice to all. Moreover, it has unfortunate political implications. In any event, it has our serious attention.¹⁶⁷

Though the IOC was certainly alert to the issue's political significance, the specific obstacles that Brundage response claimed existed, made the situation difficult to resolve without penalizing athletes and SANOC, who had no control over governmental laws and policies.

Letters continued to arrive at the IOC. A note from a resident of Surrey, England expressed a sense of disappointment to Brundage for not defending non-whites in South Africa. The author added: "South Africa is like a concentration camp to us Coloureds.... We are not allowed to participate in any games and sometimes we are even barred from watching them play. The prejudice is very bad for us."¹⁶⁸

Given Brundage's US citizenship, it appeared to some concerned citizens that the progressiveness they saw at work in America should translate to the IOC. In a long missive to Brundage, Thomas Hodge from White Plains, New York, took a similar approach.¹⁶⁹ Hodge's note pointed out several of the many issues that remained to be resolved, notwithstanding SANOC's claims to the contrary concerning changes in South African sport. Although the announcements from those in charge of sport in South Africa sounded promising, the country's racial policies continued to prevent non-whites from enjoying the full freedom that their white counterparts experienced. Furthermore, the existing sport system that offered funding and training for non-white athletes was glaringly inferior to that of white athletes. Hodge insisted that simply providing an opportunity to non-white athletes to compete in the Olympic Games was unsatisfactory because of the fundamental inequity that made it virtually

impossible for non-white athletes to prepare properly in South Africa and to even reach standards to qualify for international competition. It was the IOC's duty to deny South Africa participation in the Olympic Games until SANOC could truly support a non-segregated sport system.

Antony Steel of CARDS, meanwhile, raised an issue that went to the core of organized competitive sports, namely, that of meritocratic participation. Non-white athletes that reached the required qualifying levels of performance, he argued, must be admitted:

Following the recent assurances made by the South African authorities that in future there will be no obstacles placed in the way of the participation of any person regardless of his race or colour in South African Olympic teams, the Campaign Against Race Discrimination in Sport ... would point out that those bodies accepted for affiliation by the South African Olympic and Commonwealth Games Association [SANOC], and from which the team must be selected, all maintain a strict colour-bar by regulation or in practice, permitting only European membership. It can therefore be seen that not only does the difficulty of selection present itself, but facilities for coloured sportsmen to practice their sport are severely limited. It is clear that before South Africa can claim that there is no racial discrimination in sport, these 'European-only' clubs must be opened to enthusiasts of all races.... This Campaign ... intends to obtain full details of performances of any coloured sportsmen who reaches Olympic standards, and will challenge the South African Olympic and Commonwealth Games Association [SANOC] to honour their statement.¹⁷⁰

With watchdogs such as CARDS on the alert, the challenge for SANOC and the IOC to right the race issue in South Africa portended great difficulties. Echoing an argument made by Hodge, Steel indicated the race issue went far beyond accepting qualified non-whites for international competition. The sport structure ingrained in South African society continued to impose restrictions for non-white athletes to become successful.

In a letter from Sven Ekström,¹⁷¹ to the IOC, he characterized the debates unfolding in Sweden being based on the “crimes against humanity in South Africa.”¹⁷² There had been serious discussions in Sweden of playing South Africa in the Davis Cup, where, ultimately, it was decided to play the match. Ekström continued to provide examples when human rights were violated, such as the atrocities performed by the Nazis and Soviets, whereby, in his opinion, no major international organizations, including the IOC, expressed an explicit stance against such violent acts. The South African case contained obvious facts and evidence highlighting a racist sport system that should provide reason for action from international sport organizations.

Though the IOC and Brundage were fully aware of all the issues raised by Ekström, the IOC clung to its position of being non-political. Nonetheless, due to all these concerns, Ekström’s sport editorial department had a few questions for the IOC. He asked how apartheid can coincide with the *Olympic Charter* and if the IOC would make a pronouncement condemning South Africa?¹⁷³ Since many of these questions were addressed privately in the correspondence between IOC representatives and those closely involved with the South African issue, Ekström saw fit to send Brundage a copy of the letter he himself had sent to the IOC. He encouraged a reply. At the bottom of the copy of the Ekström letter was Brundage’s handwritten response. Brundage wrote to Ekström that the IOC was concerned with the rules and regulations only in the context of the Olympic Movement and Olympic Games. Further, since SANOC assured the opportunity of non-white athletes, the IOC had confidence in SANOC to fulfill its obligations.¹⁷⁴ Though this was not an official response from Brundage, it was clear

that the IOC had specific directives and was working with SANOC to achieve a compromise with the South African government and non-white athletes.

Meanwhile, Mayer received a letter from Antony Steel of CARDS requesting that the question of racial discrimination in South Africa be included on the agenda of the IOC meeting to follow.¹⁷⁵ His request would have involved the IOC much more closely with the politics of South Africa by connecting it to Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter*. Recalling the police raid on SASA, and pointing to the complete lack of communication with SASA representatives Brutus and Rangasamy, Steel expressed the concern that they might have been imprisoned without trial. Steel wrote: "... speaking quite personally ... I sincerely hope that the latest events in South Africa and the ruthless suppressing of the South African Sports Association because it presses for interracial sport will awaken many members of the IOC to the urgency of enforcing Article 1 of the Olympic Charter and requiring all countries either to accept it or get out of the Olympic Games."¹⁷⁶

Steel's emotionally charged letter reflected the hardening consensus of the international sporting community. In Mayer's response to Steel, he reiterated the IOC's standard response that it would not involve itself in political matters:

According to that rule, we have had a long discussion on that problem, regarding the situation in South Africa, at our Session in Munich last year. Full assurances have been given to us that all coloured man sports Associations, may be affiliated to the South African existing National Federations and therefore, to the South African Olympic and Commonwealth Games Association [SANOC]. Furthermore assurance has been given to us that all coloured athletes may take part in the Olympic Games with the South African team, as long as it is proved that they are of Olympic or international caliber. It seems that this is not the fact at the moment being.... As you can judge, our Committee has done all what was in its power and it has received full assurances on this matter. More, I think, we

cannot do. Our President has informed shortly Mr. Brutus by letter.¹⁷⁷

Although assurances had been made by SANOC to accommodate non-white participation, Mayer conceded that such assurances had not been fully met. The stance of the IOC was reiterated when Brundage officially addressed Ekström's questions raised in the 10 May letter:

... please be advised that the International Olympic Committee is concerned solely with the Olympic Movement and it does not intervene in other fields.... One of our fundamental principles is that no discrimination is allowed against any country or person on grounds of race, religion or politics. We have complete confidence in the South African [National] Olympic Committee, which is responsible for Olympic affairs in South Africa and which is well aware of our Rules and Regulations. It has assured us that no South African of Olympic calibre will be barred from the South African Olympic team by reason of race, religion or political affiliation. Moreover, the South African Government has agreed to issue the necessary exit papers.... The South African [National] Olympic Committee is also trying to promote athletic competition for all segments of the population.¹⁷⁸

It was obvious that a disconnect existed between the IOC's position and assurances given by SANOC. Though the IOC claimed to shun involvement in a country's political and domestic matters, it was those matters that eventually impinged on the principles of the Olympic Movement.

International response continued unabated. John Papandrew, Minister of the Community Church of New York, registered his protest against the inclusion of South Africa in the 1960 Rome Games. In a letter to Brundage, Papandrew opined:

The leitmotiv of the Olympic Games of Ancient Greece was to bring people together not to separate them. South Africa and its system of apartheid included in this year's Olympics is a mockery in the light of the official policy of the South African government. Going against all that is meaningful to the games and inherent within them is a deeper sense of religion, your acceptance of such a team from the

Union of South Africa is an affront to the very spirit which undergirds these games.¹⁷⁹

Papandrew's letter underscored a common theme emerging from the international narrative of criticism reaching Brundage and the IOC: that the IOC's ongoing association with South Africa risked sacrificing of values which undergirded the Olympic Games. Likewise, when A.J. Ayer, Chairman of CARDS, wrote to the IOC, he argued that Honey had not lived up to his statements made at Munich in 1959.¹⁸⁰ He pointed out specific examples of athletes who had performed better than their white competitors and reiterated the inequality and inequity experienced by non-white athletes that created a competitive disadvantage and a lack of opportunity. Nonetheless, SANOC claimed: "(1) it does not believe in discrimination but its member organisations do.... (2) that the performances [of the] coloured athletes have been exaggerated."¹⁸¹ Ayer, of course, was convinced these points were ridiculous based on the current state of the sport system in South Africa.

Marshall Knappen, a member of the American Committee on Africa, shared Ayer's stance, writing Brundage to protest that the all-white South African team's participation in the 1960 Olympic Games was in violation of Olympic rules because no non-white athletes had even been permitted to try out. He added: "From past experiences I know that the drafters of such manifestoes are inclined to overstate their case, but if the facts are as represented I hope that the South African team is barred if its organizers have not conformed to 'Olympic rules'."¹⁸²

Whether a violation of the values of the Olympic Movement, or an infraction of actual rules of the *Olympic Charter* was at issue, the international message was clear: resolve the racial discrimination or expel SANOC. The pressure felt by Brundage and

the IOC was clearly increasing, and to slightly appease the public outcries, Mayer confirmed receiving Ayer's 8 June letter, sending copies to Honey and Brundage to remind them that the assurances from SANOC had not been upheld properly.¹⁸³ Meanwhile, Brundage informed Papandrew of the current situation, reiterating yet again the standard IOC response, but providing the added argument that no sufficiently qualified non-white athletes had been located:

One of the fundamental principles of the Olympic Movement is that there shall be no discrimination by reason of race, religion or politics. The South African [National] Olympic Committee is well aware of this and we are assured that any South African athlete of Olympic Calibre, regardless of color, will be included in the South African team.... Apparently you have been misinformed.... P.S. We have copies of native African newspapers admitting that there are no negro athletes at this time of Olympic calibre.¹⁸⁴

Brundage clearly seemed to feel the rising pressure, when in a letter to Marshall Knappen, he expressed his rising annoyance with the entire South African affair:

Since I have received several letters similar to yours of June 11, I concluded that I was being made the target of a campaign. Apparently the organizers of this campaign are as you surmise, ignorant of the facts.... If you will be good enough to transmit this information to the American Committee on Africa, which might have saved everyone a great deal of trouble had it approached us directly, it will be appreciated. Of course, it must be understood that the International Olympic Committee is concerned solely with the Olympic Movement and does not intervene in other fields. It is trouble enough to keep your own house clean these days.¹⁸⁵

There is no doubt that Brundage's alarm, prompted by "uninformed international opinions," was mounting. Accommodating Brundage's request with regard to ACA, Knappen replied: "In accordance with your suggestion I am forwarding your letter on to the American Committee on Africa headquarters, with the request that they submit

directly to you the evidence they claim to have that 'no Africans are permitted even to try out for the South African team'."¹⁸⁶

Brundage was not the only person involved who was growing increasingly frustrated trying to solve the racial issue. Emery, in particular, became increasingly angered by outside, as he viewed it, uninformed opinions without any authority. He wrote to Steel in a curt tone:

Your remarks regarding the [South African National Olympic Committee] are impertinent. I will not have this letter placed before the Council of the [South African National Olympic Committee], as my Council is not interested in dealing with individuals.... I am writing this letter quite personally and suggest that until such time as you are in a position to obtain authentic reports from the so-called National Sports Federation for non-Whites in this country, you should keep your remarks to yourself.... I am sending a copy of this reply to His Grace, The Archbishop of Cape Town, Rev. Joost de Blank, who I understand is connected with your campaign.¹⁸⁷

Steel, not to be rebuffed by letters requesting proof, informed Mayer that the constitution of the South African Amateur Rowing Union, whose oarsmen would represent South Africa in the Olympics, contained an important stipulation: "No Association shall admit to membership nor permit clubs to it affiliated to admit to membership any person who is not a European and an amateur and every association shall rigorously apply the definition set out and enforce the same, and require clubs to them affiliated to do the same'."¹⁸⁸

Steel then interjected: "This clause in the constitution is completely contrary to Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter* and must surely exclude at least the South African Amateur Rowing Union from representing its country in the Olympic Games."¹⁸⁹ Ann Morrisett of the ACA also responded to Brundage's insistence on factual proof, albeit in a somewhat more conciliatory manner:

... individuals ... received replies to the effect that you are satisfied that the South African representation in the Olympics is non-discriminatory.... We understand that you are in a very difficult position and would like to clarify for you that we and those who may write to you are not conducting a 'campaign' against you personally. Nor are we ignorant of the very complex situation in South Africa which has resulted in the selection of whites only in a manner over which you and the International Olympic Committee no doubt have little control, since this is considered an 'internal matter' If you will read through the enclosed sheet, however, I think you will have a better understanding of the situation as we see it and have been able to summarize it to the best of our knowledge. It is our hope that in this one international area the policy of apartheid may receive still another challenge and possible further reconsideration by the South African government before it is too late for all concerned.¹⁹⁰

The item concluding this correspondence before the 1960 Rome Games between the IOC and international organizations, consisted of an exchange between Steel and Mayer. Steel supplemented his previous letter, casting doubt on the reliability of the *Drum* newspaper previously referenced by Brundage and Mayer in support of their position. Steel argued that the *Drum*, although targeted at a non-white readership, was owned by a white millionaire and "edited by a Brit."¹⁹¹ Instead of accepting the *Drum's* potentially biased and skewed reporting, Steel recommended the *Golden City Post*, which carried articles in opposition to the views expressed in the *Drum*. The *Golden City Post* had identified two weightlifters and six boxers worthy enough to compete for South Africa,¹⁹² and Steel highlighted an example of a non-white weightlifter "drastically" out-lifting a white opponent, but the white athlete, nevertheless, being selected. How could it have been possible, Steel demanded, that in 64 years not a single African, Indian or Coloured had merited a trial? And further, if current administrative bodies were opponents of racial discrimination, why could a non-white athlete not simply join such organizations? In addition, the terms of affiliation

with sports organizations were discriminatory for non-whites, as evidenced by the fact that ten non-white votes were equal to one white vote. Further, all committee representatives had to be white, and non-whites actually had to join separate clubs. Such dictums stymied “mixing.” Ultimately, Steel cautioned Mayer not to be duped:

Please do not believe that the SANOCGA sincerely believes in the Olympic principles. If it did it would do something about the colour-bar in associations affiliated to it. It is only the total of the affiliated organizations and the officials and officers are the same. It is only grudgingly starting to make excuses now because of the attacks of outsiders who detest the colour-bar in South African sport. Why did it do nothing before? We have written numerous letters to the SANOCGA and other South African sports bodies and often get no reply at all.¹⁹³

Mayer simply responded to Steel’s letter about the South African Rowing Federation,¹⁹⁴ by reporting that the Federation changed its constitution to accommodate both white and non-whites equally.¹⁹⁵

5. Discussion: Developments during the Phase 1955-1960

The dialogue, commentaries, press examinations, and position statements discussing the South African situation from 1955 to 1960 generated ‘three dominant voices’—South African Olympic affiliates, domestic resistance, and international community—that provided much evidence to understand the IOC’s stance in regard to South Africa by the eve of the 1960 Rome Games. Each voice had a distinct message.

With this multiplicity of voices, three factors shaped the final decision regarding South Africa’s participation in the 1960 Rome Games. First, Brundage and the IOC’s responses consistently reverted to Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter*, which included: “No discrimination is allowed against any country or person on ground of race,

religion or politics.”¹⁹⁶ Article 1 became the main element in the definition of Brundage’s and the IOC’s position on the South African situation. Second, the protocol and structure of the IOC was strongly defended in the correspondence, which defined an unrelentingly formal position to provide a rationale for the IOC’s actions and positions. The NOCs represented Olympic matters in their respective countries, and the IOC trusted the NOCs to have the ideals of the Olympic Movement and the IOC’s rules and regulations in mind when making decisions regarding participation in the Olympic Games. Further, all domestic organizations had to proceed through their NOCs in communication with the IOC. Third, the IOC maintained a firm position to not involve itself in political and domestic issues of any country. In view of these three key points, the question arose: why was South Africa still part of the Olympic Movement by the time of the 1960 Rome Games?

According to the literal interpretation of Article 1, it is reasonable to conclude that SANOC should have been excluded from the 1960 Rome Games. Racial discrimination was forbidden and SANOC clearly violated Article 1. In Chapter 4, it becomes evident why Brundage and the IOC overtly ignored the literal interpretation of Article 1. However, based on the correspondence from 1955 to 1960, Brundage’s and the IOC’s decisions were dominated by: (a) IOC protocol and structure, and (b) the IOC’s strategy not to involve itself in member countries’ domestic matters. Focussing on these two points helps to understand why South Africa was allowed to remain a member in good standing of the Olympic Movement.

From the time the South African Olympic affiliates’ voices were being heard, it was anticipated that the South African situation would quickly be resolved because of two

factors: (1) Article 1, and (2) assurances from SANOC that the issues would be resolved in due time. SANOC, though consistently mentioning the difficulties encountered from organizational, governmental, and athletic talent standpoints, was steadfast in the desire to bring about a solution by its own resolve and action, without external interference. The IOC administration was initially satisfied that SANOC would do this – after all, NOCs must take care of domestic concerns in regard to “domestic” Olympic matters. In this case, however, the South African government played such a large role in the issue that the IOC, ultimately, could not help but be involved. Although the IOC administration allowed SANOC considerable flexibility, in time it became impatient because matters did not move towards a resolution in an expedient fashion. The requests by SANOC to delay discussions on the South African situation until after the 1960 Rome Games were finally rebutted by Brundage who refused to delay any longer. Brundage reported on racial discrimination in South Africa for the first time at the 1959 Munich IOC Executive Board meeting.¹⁹⁷ At that time, a report was rendered by Honey and consequently discussed at the IOC General Session following.¹⁹⁸ Dialogue on racism in South Africa continued in the Executive Board meeting and General Session held in Rome 1960. The report of the General Session mentioned that a delegation of South African activists presented itself in Rome to confer with the Executive Board.¹⁹⁹ On that occasion, the Executive Board heard from Rev. Michael Scott, as discussed in the *Domestic Resistance* section of this chapter. A debate ensued which concluded with two findings: (1) SANOC had made a reasonable effort to implement the undertakings proposed by Honey at the 1959 Munich Sessions; and (2) considering the effort and “amiable attitude” from both the

current South African sport bodies and the organization of non-white associations, future misunderstandings from the current South African sport bodies in regard to non-white inclusion should be minimal.²⁰⁰

Brundage's and the IOC's trust in SANOC to resolve the racial issue was not necessarily violated in their eyes because it was interpreted that SANOC had done its best to resolve the complicated situation. On the other hand, SANOC's efforts clearly were failures in the mind of domestic resistance and international constituents. However, did its rising unrest matter? Not to Brundage and the IOC, who wanted SANOC to solve the issue on its own, keeping the IOC out of political and domestic involvement. Abiding by IOC protocol and structure, and a policy to be non-political, the voices of the domestic and international resistance were heard, but no action resulted. The information from domestic and international sources, though valuable to Brundage, did not prompt him to meet the issue "head on," but he managed to delay its resolution until after the 1960 Games through a policy firmly focussed on formal procedure and institutional arrangement. The IOC was concerned with SANOC and its commitment to the *Olympic Charter*. Domestic resistance, the international community, and even the South African government's laws and policies had minimal influence on the immediate decision to not ban South Africa from the 1960 Rome Games.

Despite Brundage and the IOC insisting that they stood by the non-discrimination ideals expressed in Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter*, their implicit acceptance of South Africa into the Olympic Games in full awareness of SANOC's complicit actions, amounted to institutionalized racism. Such racism, as was mentioned above, was not

the result of explicitly expressed racializing positions or actions, but emerged from the structural properties of the social system within which people and organizations act: people act to effect certain outcomes while disregarding racially discriminatory consequences resulting from their actions. Since the rules and regulations of the IOC permitted and encouraged SANOC to ignore the domestic politics of South Africa in order 'to keep sport and politics' separate and thus be able to participate in the Olympic Games, SANOC's actions, directed at adhering to this foundational IOC dictum, amounted, if not to outright active support for apartheid policies, then at least to an indirect support of the status quo by ignoring its racializing implications. Whatever explanation was offered by Brundage and the IOC, any arrangement to accommodate South Africa's participation in the IOC, Olympic Games, and Olympic Movement that did not include the complete abolition of racial discrimination can be interpreted as accepting racism in South African sport.

My task in the next chapter, treating the 1960-1964 period, will, therefore, be to discover how – and if so, to what extent – the messages from the 'three dominant voices' changed and how the Brundage and the IOC negotiated with those voices to affect SANOC's existence and South African sport.

Endnotes for Chapter Two

- ¹ Reginald Honey to Avery Brundage, 22 February 1949, Avery Brundage Collection (hereafter cited as ABC), box 58, reel 34.
- ² There are a variety of versions of the name for the national Olympic committee in South Africa through its history, but the South African National Olympic Committee (hereafter cited as SANOC) will be used throughout this dissertation and endnote section.
- ³ Brundage to Honey, 11 April 1949, ABC, box 58, reel 34.
- ⁴ Ira Emery to Brundage, 19 May 1950, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ⁵ Ibid. Underscored in original.
- ⁶ Brundage to Emery, 6 July 1950, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ⁷ Emery to Brundage, 10 April 1951, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ⁸ Brundage to Emery, 26 April 1951, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ⁹ The item was published in one of the Johannesburg newspapers. A clipping of the article itself, or a specific reference, was not included with the letter in the ABC.
- ¹⁰ Emery to Brundage, 22 September 1953, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹¹ Brundage to SANOC (Attn: Ira Emery), 2 November 1953, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹² Emery to Brundage, 13 October 1955, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹³ Brundage to Emery, 20 October 1955, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹⁴ Emery to Brundage, 7 December 1955, ABC, box 144, reel 80, and Brundage to Emery, 22 December 1955, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹⁵ Emery to Brundage, 20 January 1956, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹⁶ Ibid.
- ¹⁷ Brundage to Emery, 27 February 1956, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹⁸ International Olympic Committee (hereafter cited as IOC), *The Olympic Games: Fundamental Principles, Rules and Regulations, General Information* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 1956), 9
- ¹⁹ Brundage to Honey, 28 February 1956, ABC, box 58, reel 34, and Brundage to Honey, 23 April 1956, ABC, box 58, reel 34.
- ²⁰ Emery to Brundage, 12 June 1956, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ²¹ Ibid.
- ²² Emery to Brundage, 27 November 1957, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ²³ Ibid.
- ²⁴ Emery to Eugene Gouleau, 27 November 1957, ABC, box 144, reel 80 found in ibid.
- ²⁵ Ibid.
- ²⁶ Ibid.
- ²⁷ Brundage to Emery, 27 December 1957, ABC, box 144, reel 80.

- 28 IOC, "1959. Munich," in *IOC Executive Committee Minutes, Volume II (1948-1969)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 143.
- 29 Emery to Brundage, 25 February 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 30 Brundage to Emery, 7 April 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 31 Emery to Brundage, 18 April 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 32 Ibid.
- 33 Ibid. Capitalized in original.
- 34 Brundage to Emery, 27 April 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 35 Emery to Brundage, 6 May 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 36 Ibid.
- 37 Emery to Brundage, 5 May 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80, found in *ibid.*
- 38 Emery to Brundage, 6 May 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 39 Emery to Brundage, 11 September 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80. (Note: date was found at the bottom of the letter)
- 40 Emery to Brundage, 18 September 1958, ABC box 144, reel 80.
- 41 Brundage to Emery, 27 September 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 42 Emery to Brundage, 14 October 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 43 Emery to G.R. Smith, 3 October 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80, found in *ibid.*
- 44 Brundage to Emery, 24 October 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 45 Emery to Brundage, 31 October 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 46 Emery to Brundage, 7 November 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 47 Emery to Brundage, 27 November 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 48 Emery to Brundage, 3 December 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 49 Emery to Brundage, 8 January 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 50 "Clean Up Native Sport Demand," *The Star, Johannesburg*, 3 December 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80, found in *ibid.*
- 51 Emery to Brundage, 15 January 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 52 Emery to International Sport Federations (hereafter cited as ISF), 15 January 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80, found in *ibid.*
- 53 Brundage to Emery, 28 January 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 54 Ibid.
- 55 Emery to Brundage, 6 February 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 56 Brundage to Emery, 21 February 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 57 Emery to Brundage, 4 May 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 58 Ibid.
- 59 Emery to D.P.T. Payn, 1 May 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80, found in *ibid.*
- 60 D.F. Botha to Emery, 29 April 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80, found in Emery to Brundage, 4 May 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 61 Ibid.
- 62 Emery to Payn, 1 May 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80, found in Emery to Brundage, 4 May, ABC, box 144, reel 80.

- ⁶³ Emery to Brundage, 9 May 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80, and Smith to B. Francis, 9 May 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ⁶⁴ Sol. M. Crutse, "A Plea for Co-ordination," 1 May 1959, box 144, reel 80, found in Emery to Brundage, 11 May 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ⁶⁵ Emery to Brundage, 11 May 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ⁶⁶ A.G. McKenzie to Mayer, 3 June 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ⁶⁷ Special Representative, "Non-European Sport Must Be Developed: South Africa Will Stay in the Olympic Games," *The Star, Johannesburg*, 28 May 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 81, found in *ibid*.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid*.
- ⁶⁹ Mayer to SANOC (Attn: Emery), 4 June 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ⁷⁰ *Ibid*.
- ⁷¹ Emery to Brundage, 11 June 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ⁷² Emery to Brundage, 22 June 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ⁷³ *Ibid*.
- ⁷⁴ *Ibid*.
- ⁷⁵ H.B. Klopper and Emery to Brundage, 24 June 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ⁷⁶ Brundage to SANOC, 7 September 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ⁷⁷ Emery to IOC Secretary, 20 October 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ⁷⁸ Emery to International Cycling Union Secretary, 20 October 1959, ABC, box 14, reel 80, found in *ibid*.
- ⁷⁹ Emery to IOC Secretary, 28 October 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ⁸⁰ Emery to IOC Chancellor, 27 November 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ⁸¹ Emery to Brundage, 28 December 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ⁸² Emery to Brundage, 7 January 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ⁸³ Brundage to Emery, 12 January 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ⁸⁴ Emery to IOC Chancellor, 31 March 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81. Capitalized in original.
- ⁸⁵ Emery to Brundage, 14 April 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ⁸⁶ "Sport Body Files Seized by Police," *The Star, Johannesburg*, 13 April 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81, found in *ibid*.
- ⁸⁷ Emery to Brundage, 29 April 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ⁸⁸ President of South African Bantu Amateur Athletic and Cycling Association to Secretary General of SANOC, 25 April 1960, box 144, reel 81, found in *ibid*.
- ⁸⁹ Emery to Brundage, 2 June 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ⁹⁰ Emery to Mayer, 5 August 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ⁹¹ Mayer to Emery, 8 August 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ⁹² Smith to Brundage, 11 November 1954, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ⁹³ *Ibid*.
- ⁹⁴ *Ibid*.
- ⁹⁵ Brundage to South African Amateur Weightlifting and Bodybuilding Federation (Attn: Smith; hereafter cited as SAAWBF), 29 December 1954, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ⁹⁶ Mayer to SAAWBF, 1 October 1956, ABC, box 144, reel 80.

- ⁹⁷ Dennis Brutus to Brundage, 29 December 1957, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ⁹⁸ Brutus to K.S. Duncan, 25 November 1957, ABC, box 144, reel 80, found in *ibid*.
- ⁹⁹ Brundage to Brutus, 10 January 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹⁰⁰ Brutus to Brundage, 12 February 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹⁰¹ Brutus to Brundage, 14 April 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹⁰² Brundage to SAAWBF, 28 April 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹⁰³ Brundage to Emery, 27 February 1956, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹⁰⁴ Emery to Smith, 6 May 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹⁰⁵ Emery to Brundage, 11 September 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80. (Note: the date was had written at the bottom of the letter)
- ¹⁰⁶ Brutus to Brundage, 8 September 1958, ABC, Box 144, reel 80.
- ¹⁰⁷ *Ibid*.
- ¹⁰⁸ Brundage to SAAWBF, 27 September 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80, found in Brundage to Emery, 27 September 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹⁰⁹ Brutus to Brundage, undated, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹¹⁰ Emery to Smith, 3 October 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80, found in Emery to Brundage, 14 October 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹¹¹ Smith to Brundage, 5 November 1958, ABC, Box 144, reel 80.
- ¹¹² Smith to Emery, 5 November 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80, found in *ibid*.
- ¹¹³ R.S. Govender to Brundage, 3 December 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹¹⁴ Brundage to Govender, 9 January 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹¹⁵ *Ibid*.
- ¹¹⁶ Brutus to Brundage, 23 January 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹¹⁷ Brutus to Mayer, 23 January 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80, found in *ibid*.
- ¹¹⁸ *Ibid*.
- ¹¹⁹ Brundage to Brutus, 3 February 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹²⁰ Emery to Brundage, 6 February 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹²¹ Brutus to Brundage, 13 February 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹²² Brutus to Mayer, 19 February 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹²³ *Ibid*.
- ¹²⁴ G.K. Rangasamy Statement, 27 February 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹²⁵ *Ibid*.
- ¹²⁶ Brutus to Mayer, 27 March 1959, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹²⁷ Mayer to Brutus, 1 April 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹²⁸ Brutus to Brundage, 30 April 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹²⁹ Brutus to Mayer, 29 April 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80, found in *ibid*.
- ¹³⁰ Mayer to Brutus, 1 May 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹³¹ Mayer to Antony Steel, 2 May 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹³² Brutus to Brundage, 5 May 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹³³ Mayer to Brutus, 8 May 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- ¹³⁴ Brundage to Brutus, 11 May 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.

- 135 South African Sports Association (hereafter cited as SASA) Circular, undated, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 136 Brutus to Emery, 7 June 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 137 Ibid.
- 138 SASA Statement, 8 June 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 139 Brutus to Emery, 19 June 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 140 Brutus to Brundage, 19 June 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 141 Brundage to SASA, 7 September 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 142 SASA to Brundage, 16 February 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 143 Brutus to Brundage, 13 April 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 144 Brutus to Honey, 25 April 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 145 Brutus to C. Oehley, 25 April 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81, found in *ibid*.
- 146 SASA Statement, 12 May 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 147 Brundage to Brutus, 4 May 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 148 Emery to Brundage, 14 April 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 149 SASA Statement, 12 May 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 150 Ibid.
- 151 Brutus to Brundage, 14 May 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 152 Rangasamy to Brundage, 24 July 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 153 Brutus to Brundage, 24 July 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 154 Brutus (SASA Statement), 2 August 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 155 Michael Scott to Brundage, 22 August 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 156 Michael Scott, "Address for Presentation to the International Olympic Games Committee, Rome, August 1960," August 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 157 Ibid.
- 158 Olaf Ditlev-Simonsen to Mayer, 26 October 1956, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 159 Mayer to Ditlev-Simonsen, 30 December 1956, ABC, box 144, reel 80.
- 160 Ibid.
- 161 Secretary-General of the Milo Academy to Brundage, 14 January 1957, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 162 Brundage to Secretary-General of Milo Academy, 19 February 1957, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 163 Glyn Landav to Duncan, 27 March 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 18, found in Gladys Griffiths to Otto Mayer, 27 March 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 164 John Williams to Brundage, 22 April 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 165 Brundage to American Committee on Africa (hereafter cited as ACA), 28 April 1958, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 166 Lord Hemingford to Brundage, 27 April 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 167 Brundage to Hemingford, 9 May 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 168 A Surry citizen (name illegible on letter) to Brundage, 20 May 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 80. (Note: This letter was hand written and is interpreted by the author)
- 169 Thomas Hodge to IOC, 30 June 1959, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

- ¹⁷⁰ Steel to National Olympic Committees (hereafter cited as NOC), undated, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁷¹ Sven Ekström was also committee President of the Swedish National Sport Journalists.
- ¹⁷² Ekström to IOC, 10 May 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁷³ Ibid.
- ¹⁷⁴ Ekström to Brundage, 12 May 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁷⁵ Steel to IOC Chancellor, 12 May 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁷⁶ Ibid.
- ¹⁷⁷ Mayer to Steel, 17 May 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁷⁸ Brundage to Ekström, May 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁷⁹ John Papandrew to Brundage, 7 June 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁸⁰ A.J. Ayer to Brundage, 8 June 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁸¹ Ibid
- ¹⁸² Marshall Knappen to Brundage, 11 June 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81. Some letters from the public should be weighted carefully when questionable prejudice comments are included, such as in Knappen's letter, "I am completely opposed to present recruiting practices in use on all too many American campuses, where track athletics should be an activity for college students and not for hired European and Caribbean imports."
- ¹⁸³ Mayer to Ayer, 13 June 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁸⁴ Brundage to Papandrew, 14 June 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁸⁵ Brundage to Knappen, 16 June 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁸⁶ Knappen to Brundage, 17 June 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁸⁷ Emery to Steel, 17 June 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁸⁸ Steel to Mayer, 13 July 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁸⁹ Ibid.
- ¹⁹⁰ Ann Morrissett to Brundage, 15 July 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁹¹ Steel to Mayer, 25 July 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁹² Ibid.
- ¹⁹³ Ibid.
- ¹⁹⁴ Mayer to Steel, 25 July 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁹⁵ Mayer to Emery, 8 August 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁹⁶ International Olympic Committee (hereafter cited as IOC), *The Olympic Games: Fundamental Principles, Rules and Regulations, General Information* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 1956), 9
- ¹⁹⁷ IOC, "1959. Munich," in *IOC Executive Committee Minutes, Volume II (1948-1969)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: International Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 143.
- ¹⁹⁸ IOC, "56th IOC Session, Munich, 1959," in *IOC General Session Minutes, Volume IV (1956-1988)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: International Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 40.
- ¹⁹⁹ IOC, "58th IOC Session, Rome, 1959," in *IOC General Session Minutes, Volume IV (1956-1988)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: International Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 57.

- ²⁰⁰ IOC, "1960. Rome," in *IOC Executive Committee Minutes, Volume II (1948-1969)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: International Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 151.

Chapter Three:

Avery Brundage and the IOC's First Confrontation with the South African National Olympic Committee, 1960-1964

1. Introduction

The dialogue between the International Olympic Committee (IOC), South African Olympic affiliates, domestic resistance forces, and the international community continued with substantial force between the 1960 Rome Games and the 1964 Tokyo Games. Each voice remained strong, their respective messages about the status of non-whites in South African sport were consistent. To appease the IOC, the South African Olympic affiliates, represented primarily by the South African National Olympic Committee (SANOC), engaged in limited efforts to integrate non-white athletes and organizations into the current white-dominated sport system. The integration process, handled with extreme caution, was ultimately directed by South African government policies. Domestic resistance entities maintained a contradictory stance to SANOC's feeble efforts and the South African government's apartheid restrictions. Those supporting the domestic resistance network vied to take control of SANOC as the legitimate National Olympic Committee (NOC), or, at the very least, to have SANOC suspended until the South African situation was corrected. The international community persisted to advocate for the domestic resistance. Until SANOC abided by IOC rules and regulations, the international community petitioned for SANOC's suspension or expulsion and a new non-racial NOC to be established in South Africa.

As these voices became more vigorous with their messages enunciated more clearly, it became apparent how they shaped the responses and decisions affecting SANOC's position and South Africa's participation in the IOC, Olympic Games, and Olympic Movement. The years of correspondence, information, and action leading up to the 1964 Tokyo Games yielded a different result than the years approaching the 1960 Rome Games. By 1964, Brundage and the IOC did not trust SANOC's commitment and ability to resolve the racial issues in South African Olympic sport. The result was a firm decision to retract the invitation to South Africa to participate in the 1964 Tokyo Games.

2. South African Olympic Affiliates

Immediately following the 1960 Rome Games, Emery thanked Mayer and Brundage for how they dealt with the South African case. His comments were optimistic: "I do sincerely hope that you will realise that all the information I have given both you and Mr. Brundage has been completely honest.... Our team from the commencement to the completion of the Games, met with nothing else but courtesy and friendliness from all the competing nations, irrespective of race, colour or creed."¹ Mayer's response to Emery assumed a "business as usual" manner.²

Four months later, SANOC extended its activities against the upstart South African Sports Association (SASA) in order to retain power in South African Olympic sport. Emery reaffirmed SANOC's position to Brundage by attacking those in charge of SASA:

The efforts by Brutus and Rangasamy are absolutely political.... Their demands that we be expelled from the Olympic Games of 1964 will again be made to the IOC and it is going to be the same thing over again and we must deny their allegations and again give our promise

that if any of the non-Whites are good enough at the trials, they will represent South Africa in international sport.³

Emery did not think that these activities by SASA could be overcome without the IOC's cooperation: "It would be appreciated if your Chancellor could send us a copy of any report that may be received by him from Brutus, as they studiously avoid letting us know what they have said to the IOC. To this date we have not yet received a copy of the long report they placed before the IOC 12 months ago."⁴ To mitigate the controversy associated with SANOC, Emery deferred all other issues in order to maintain focus on SANOC's goal of repairing its image. To this end, Emery announced the affiliation of two non-white sports associations in boxing and athletics, with the current national bodies, placing this move in the context of his opposition to Brutus: "In the opinion of my Association it would be wrong for the proposition forwarded you by Mr. Brutus to be placed on the agenda for the meeting in Athens, as we have repeatedly told you this is a political body and does not control non-White sport in this country."⁵ SANOC evidently was frustrated from having to continually defend its position on non-white sport in response to Brutus' and SASA's political activities.

To maintain a certain level of transparency and dialogue, Emery openly discussed with Brundage the correspondence sent to Mayer and Brutus. Mentioning once again SANOC's goals of current affiliation and future affiliation of the non-white Olympic sporting bodies, Emery continued to attack Brutus and SASA:

We again give you an assurance that the [South African National Olympic Committee] is doing all possible to meet the wishes of the IOC in regard to all races being recognised and you will appreciate that the affiliation of the above two bodies is proof of this.... It is the opinion of my association that it would be wrong for the Notice of Motion forwarded by Mr. Brutus to be placed on your agenda in Athens, as we have repeatedly told you and given you facts that the

South African Sports Association is more interested in political matters than in promoting sport for the non-Whites. We have repeatedly asked this body to give us the names of their so-called affiliated bodies, the name and addresses of their secretaries, and what sports meetings they have organised. We still have had no reply to this question.... From this you will see that events are moving in a direction the IOC requires, and we ask you again not to be fooled by Mr. Brutus or any member of his committee or any person such as the Rev. M. Scott who knows nothing of the actual conditions regarding our efforts in having the non-Whites properly represented.⁶

Emery insinuated that SANOC was doing everything possible to fulfill the promises made towards change in South African sport. On the same day Emery wrote to Brundage, Mayer responded to Emery's 9 February 1961 letter, pointing to certain discrepancies between Emery's public and private stance:

There seems to be a little contradiction in your letter compared with the press article, when you say that it will permit proper trials for the selection of your future teams. While in the cutting it is said that trials are prohibited and that they should take place somewhere in Rhodesia or in private. In my personal opinion there should be open trials in the Union. This might also be an important problem for you to study in view to find a satisfactory solution.... Regarding Mr. Brutus' letter I am expecting Mr. Brundage's suggestion before replying. I just received today another letter from him sending a protest against efforts to secure recognition by the IOC for the International World Judo Federation.... it is not Mr. Brutus' business to interfere in this problem ...⁷

Although Mayer responded to Brutus on this matter assuring that the IOC only recognized one International Sports Federation (ISF) in each sport and that any National Sport Federation (NSF) might apply to an ISF,⁸ Brutus was undoubtedly overestimating SASA's influence and power with the IOC.

This increase in the international correspondence on the South African issue, and the issue's resulting increased international profile could be regarded as progress of sorts, but it was still questionable as to how the IOC viewed Brutus, SASA, and those

in charge of the domestic movement. For example, after thanking Emery for the update on the current advances in various South African sporting circles, Brundage reassured Emery that there was no salient reason to include Brutus' motion on the agenda for the upcoming June IOC General Session in Greece.⁹ Brundage may have felt that Brutus was not an important voice, or that the South African issue was actually improving. Regardless of Brundage's own thoughts on Brutus, Emery persisted in seeking to disavow Brutus while supporting SANOC's place in the Olympic Movement, pointing to what he identified as Brutus' "not very helpful" actions.¹⁰ As evidence, Emery provided an article discussing the development of non-white athletes, as well as his most recent correspondence with Brutus in which Brutus and SASA, had given SANOC an ultimatum, pointing out that SASA was "fully determined that all sportsmen shall be given fair and equal treatment, particularly in matters of organisation, representation, facilities and trials."¹¹ Emery responded by reaffirming SANOC's authority:

The [South African National Olympic Committee] deals only with South African Governing Bodies of Sport who are affiliated to their individual international federations.... Your reference to the International Olympic Committee is noted and a photostatic copy of your letter is being sent to the IOC ... The IOC has been advised that non-white associations for athletics, cycling and boxing have been affiliated to the S.A. Governing Bodies of Sport. When further non-white associations affiliate to the respective S.A. Governing Body as has been done by the three mentioned, the IOC will be advised accordingly.¹²

SANOC remained in control of South African Olympic sport, due to South Africa's impending separation from the Commonwealth on 1 June 1961, but Emery wondered whether the end of South Africa's participation in the Commonwealth Games would have Olympic implications.¹³ After hearing that there might be a possible connection

between the Commonwealth Games and the IOC through South Africa's IOC representative Reginald Honey, Emery asked Brundage, should he be contacted by the Commonwealth committee, to advise it of the progress of non-white athletes and organizations in South Africa. Emery appeared to need this support from the IOC because of the opposition's widening scope, now counting the newly formed All-African Sports Federation among its members. Pointing to news reports, Emery noted that the Federation had decided that:

... if a team from South Africa [was] selected for international meetings which ha[d] been dictated by race, the Federation [would] withdraw all African entries.... The threat implied ... that Afro-Asian sporting associations would then appeal to British and other organisations to take similar steps, thus forcing South African White sportsmen, and women out of world class athletics.... We in South Africa, do not know the make-up of this All-African Sports Federation, but I, personally, am of the opinion that Mr. Brutus through the South African Sports Association has representation on this body.¹⁴

Clearly, such a development would have left SANOC in a difficult situation. To solidify South Africa's stance, Emery confirmed that, if possible, Reginald Honey would personally advise the IOC on the South African position, either at the meeting in Athens, or in a personal conversation with Brundage.¹⁵ In support of SANOC's position, Emery provided Brundage with an example of the progress he saw occurring in South Africa,¹⁶ drawing attention to the remarks by then current SANOC President, General H.B. Klopper: "If and when a non-white sportsman in South Africa reaches world standard, the Olympic Games Council will do all in its power to get him overseas for international competition.... We encourage sport among all races in the Union, within the traditional policy of South African."¹⁷ Nonetheless, South African policies forbade mixed sport, so to divert responsibility from SANOC, General Klopper added

that SANOC did not make policy, but that the NSFs were charged with addressing mixed sports and the affiliation process of non-white associations. Shifting responsibility to the government and NSFs did not release SANOC from its obligations to enforce change, but it weakened the strength of the example used by Emery.

When Brundage responded to Emery, he reassured the latter of two issues: first, the subject of South Africa would not be on the upcoming agenda for the IOC General Session in Athens; and, second, the IOC had no connection with the British Empire and Commonwealth Games, but, if asked, the IOC would be glad to give its opinion on any progress made in South African sport.¹⁸ This support from Brundage echoed Mayer's somewhat livelier letter in regard to Emery's concerns about the Commonwealth Games: "In my opinion, we have nothing to do with the Commonwealth Games, as they never asked our patronage and they prefer to ignore us (all the best for the IOC). Why should we now interfere when there is some trouble??? ... They should look into their own affairs. I think the South Africans are mistaken if they think that the British will ask us anything!"¹⁹

Relieved by the assurances from Brundage, Emery remained optimistic, "It is going to be a slow battle, but I am convinced that ultimately at least when the Tokyo Games are held, South Africa will have overcome the racial prejudice in sport."²⁰ He offered newspaper reports as evidence of SANOC's efforts to overcome the colour bar, pointing to examples where, as he saw it "...South African white officials are doing their utmost to get the non-whites well trained in athletics and other sports.... Sooner or later when the non-whites are properly trained and coached, we will find one who can represent South Africa."²¹

According to SANOC and the IOC, there was absolutely no confusion about who was in charge of the Olympic Movement in South Africa. Mayer reminded SANOC of its responsibility to control IOC intellectual property from being used by outside organizations, such as a Johannesburg club naming a competition *Olympiad of the Hellenic in Africa*: "This is an abuse of the terms which are our property and should not be allowed. It is the duty of the National Olympic Committees to control such abuses and we do hope that such terms which have no connection at all with such competitions will be cancelled".²²

The ongoing dialogue between the IOC and SANOC confirmed the stability of the relationship. Nonetheless, later that month, Mayer wrote to the new Secretary General of SANOC, L.M. Francey, to remind her that the IOC kept a constant watch, raising specific criteria of athletic performance and "required standards" in conjunction with the problem of racial exclusionary policies as the underlying issue:

I note with satisfaction that your Executive have asked you to reiterate your policy as previously given to us, that you will stand by your undertaking that should non-white sportsmen be up to the required standard he will be considered for inclusion with teams sent overseas. If this is already an important step, I must say that one hears often that the White Sports Organizations in South African do nothing to help non-whites to reach that required standard and that they are even not allowed to train with white athletes, nor can a white athlete race with a non-white. As an example I may mention the case of that young white cyclist who followed only (without taking part) a race of non-white cyclists and who has been suspended. Those are the facts which are making very bad publicity over here and in the World.... I have also read today in the European press that the South African Football Association has been suspended by the International Body (FIFA) just because of those racial discriminations.... Therefore the problem is, in my opinion, not at all settled.²³

Mayer remained apprehensive about SANOC's willingness to improve South African Olympic sport for non-whites. At the bottom of Brundage's copy of the above letter, Mayer characterized as "ridiculous" SANOC's argument about the deficiencies of non-white athletes' performance standards since SANOC "[did] all they can not to help them to reach that standard."²⁴

Mayer's reservations of SANOC's ability to improve South African sport were confirmed in a handwritten letter from Reginald Honey explaining South Africa's woes. Although SANOC was trying hard to abide by IOC rules, Honey believed the troubles with Olympic officials continued to increase. Especially with the foolish statements from the government, which continually put pressure on SANOC in an already difficult situation.²⁵ Brundage agreed with Honey and informed him that the South African situation will be one of the topics discussed at an upcoming IOC Executive Board meeting. Based on the many newspaper clippings from South Africa and the letters of protest received by the IOC, the situation was far from becoming better.²⁶

Attempting to keep the dialogue going forward, Francey sought to update Mayer before submitting a formal report based on the next SANOC Executive Board meeting on 27 March 1962. She informally advised Mayer on a number of issues, such as the movement towards integrating white and non-white athletes and organizations, SANOC's renewed commitment to the promises of Reginald Honey, the improvement of non-white athletes' performances, and the increase in multi-racial teams for international competitions.²⁷ In addition, Francey reported the challenges posed by Brutus and SASA:

We seem to find it most difficult to make him understand that as an Association controlling a number of sports they cannot have direct affiliation to our Association, but that the individual sports can become affiliated to the various S.A. Governing Bodies of Sport, and have equal membership. We have a South African Sports Federation (White Association) and the Maccabi Games Association who are interested in various sports but they do not demand affiliation to our Association – we are all autonomous bodies but we try and assist each other when the occasion rises.... there is nothing to prevent the South African Sports Association to affiliate the sections which are applicable to the S.A. Governing Bodies of Sport, which have direct representation on our Association.²⁸

Francey strove to keep SANOC at a distance from SASA, whereas SASA seemed to wish to ignore that SANOC was in charge and that SASA had to go through the same channels as all other organizations to gain representation in South African Olympic sport. In the main, SANOC remained as confident as ever about its capabilities to retain control over the transition process in South African Olympic sport. However, according to Francey, since progress was happening in South African sport as a result of the continual effort to welcome non-white athletes and sporting bodies, SANOC was perplexed when receiving news from the IOC Executive Board that no progress had been made in regard to the inclusion of the non-white population.²⁹ Francey insisted that SANOC was abiding by its promises: “... we have no intention of diverting in the very least from the Olympic ideal, of selecting the best athletes in all Olympic sports irrespective of colour, provided such athletes reach standards laid down by the International Olympic Committee,” and the relationship between SANOC and the IOC was being tested by “a politically inspired controversy aimed at the breaking of [their] good relations.”³⁰

In response, Mayer reiterated the IOC’s position and in particular the obligations arising from Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter* forbidding discrimination on grounds of

race, religion, or political affiliation. "Unfortunately," Mayer noted, while somewhat exonerating SANOC itself, "facts are there to prove that the elimination of non-whites athletes is still in mind in several circles, but probably not in the idea of your association, who still keeps the responsibility, where Olympic matters are concerned."³¹

Both Francey's and Mayer's letters bespoke the mindset of SANOC and the IOC, respectively. Although each letter seemed confrontational, Gen. Klopper noted the IOC's reluctance to break the current relationship, reassuring Mayer that SANOC would pursue a steady policy course of action.³² However, Mayer's official update to SANOC after the 1962 IOC General Session in Moscow, and in response to Reginald Honey's report at the General Session as well as to new political developments in South Africa, was anything but reassuring – the threat "immediate exclusion"³³ was voiced:

... in Rome in 1960, we were assured that your Government would permit the inclusion of coloured athletes on your team for the Olympic Games. Now we understand the situation has changed and that your Government has forbidden such a mixed team. In this event, of course, you cannot fulfill your obligations as a National Olympic Committee recognized by the International Olympic Committee.... It was decided therefore that you must be warned that unless your Government withdraws this prohibition so that you can carry out your work in full conformity with Olympic statutes, before October 1963, the date of our next Session in Nairobi, that we will be forced, much as we dislike to take such a drastic action against one of our loyal National Olympic Committees, to suspend the South African [National] Olympic Committee until it can function correctly.³⁴

SANOC, so it appeared, had rather overestimated the effectiveness of its own efforts. Indeed, its future position with the IOC seemed to be uncertain, but ultimately a more expanded time line was defined to resolve the issue; Emery expressed his

appreciation, insisting again on the convenient stance of sport being a non-political entity:

... as long as the Group Areas Act is in being in the Republic, Whites and non-Whites will never be permitted to compete in trials against each other.... I take this opportunity of congratulating the IOC on giving South Africa at least 12 months to make up their mind about inter-racial sport.... I am not a politician, nor do I take sides in any political matters, but if we belong to the IOC surely we must abide by the rules or if we cannot abide by the rules, we should gracefully withdraw.³⁵

Complications, meanwhile, also arose with regard to direct political opposition resulting from the actions of Brutus: Mayer advised Francey of Brutus' aim "to form a new 'Non-racial South African [National] Olympic Committee' which would ask for recognition by the IOC ... I [understand] that your South African Government is not going to stop the racial discrimination in sport, which is very unfortunate."³⁶

Brutus' non-racial organization might have challenged the legitimacy of SANOC, already weakened by the actions of the South African government. In response, SANOC member Jan Botha advised Mayer of the evolution of SANOC's efforts, downplaying the legitimacy of the new organization:

I can, in the meantime, assure you that large sums of money are being spent on the development of sport for our Coloured people and that the European officials and sportsmen are making a real effort to assist them in coaching, officiating and administration.... The so-called South African Sports Association does not represent any appreciable proportion of the Coloured people and virtually amounts to a self-proclaimed group. The majority of our Coloured people are happy to co-operate with the existing governing bodies of sport and the [South African National Olympic Committee].³⁷

About a month later, Botha followed up with the lengthy documentation of favourable comments by a track coach in the United States concerning the opportunity and assistance given to non-white athletes in South Africa,³⁸ but Mayer dismissed the

veracity of Botha's source: "... I must say that we have other sources of information which do not quite correspond with [his] opinion."³⁹

By early November 1962, Francey had become concerned with determining the degree of Mayer's involvement with SASA in forming the South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee (SAN-ROC). Had the IOC Executive in fact decided, without informing SANOC, to forward a copy of their rules to SAN-ROC, "this unofficial body who are trying to undermine the good work done by this body"?⁴⁰ SAN-ROC, after all, merely consisted of "small splinter groups who are not accepting affiliation to the recognised National Sports Bodies."⁴¹ Francey pursued the same line of investigation with Brundage himself, endeavouring to determine at what level of authority the IOC's exchanges with SAN-ROC had been authorized. We "would like to know upon whose instructions [Mayer] is corresponding with this unofficial body; whether it was upon the instructions of your Executive or not," she criticized the IOC, "I can assure you that my Council are most unhappy about the position which appears to exist between the IOC and this splinter group.... We are most anxious to maintain the happy relationship which has existed between the IOC and the Association since 19[08], and we should like to be reassured that no official negotiations have been ordered by yourself or your Executive with the unofficial body."⁴² Francey attached clippings from the South African *Rand Daily Mail* and *Dagbreek* newspapers which, she explained, indicated the degree of confusion and mistrust created by the IOC's ambiguous position. She urged Brundage "to look into this matter as soon as possible, and let me have your airmail reply."⁴³

In his response, Mayer sought to allay some of SANOC's concerns, adopting the formal position that "[u]p to the time of writing we have not received any application for recognition from SAN-ROC. As long as your Association remains recognised by us, there is no reason to recognise another body as we can recognise only one Olympic committee in a country."⁴⁴ Mayer went on to emphasize that the IOC's discussion relative to the position of SANOC had until then focussed on "suspension ... this still does not mean that your association will be expelled. ... Furthermore, may I add that I did not correspond at all with SAN-ROC of which I ignore the existence by [sic] the time being. It is certain that if they write and if I should have to give them a brief answer you will get a copy of our letter as we always have done in the past."⁴⁵ Mayer ruled out negotiations with SAN-ROC in the near future. Brundage also responded to Francey's missive, expressing sympathy for SANOC's difficult position but expressing the hope that "somehow the necessary adjustments can be made to permit you to function according to the Olympic code, and we have no intention of dealing with anyone else. Since the difficulty seems to rest in the laws or policies of your country, it is doubtful that any other organization could function any better than you can."⁴⁶

As a strategic goodwill gesture, Francey and SANOC extended an invitation to Mayer to visit South Africa.⁴⁷ Mayer cited his busy schedule as preventing him from accepting the invitation himself, but suggested the new delegate for African affairs instead, who would report back to Brundage himself.

South Africa's political position seemed to shift somewhat over two months later. It became known to Francey that Mayer was waiting for SANOC's reaction to a letter by the Minister of the Interior who had stated: "Should there be Non-Whites who

qualify for inclusion in the South African contingent which will participate in the next Olympic Games, application for travelling facilities should be made in good time and each application will then be considered on its own merits and in the light of Government policy.”⁴⁸ It seemed that the Minister gave SANOC the green light to include non-white athletes, but now it would be up to SANOC to make sure that if non-white athletes were selected, they made it to the Olympic Games. Final responsibility with issuing the necessary travel documents, however, would remain with the Minister, who would ensure that “white and non-white citizens of South Africa seeking passports ...ha[d] a clear character.”⁴⁹ SANOC was elated with the Minister’s statement because it meant both white and non-whites would have equal opportunity for selection to and participation in the Olympic Games. To add to the positive news, Francey also referred to a press release mentioning that members of SANOC had engaged in informal discussions earlier in January with representatives from SASA.⁵⁰ SANOC’s President subsequently reaffirmed that if a non-white athlete reached international standard, she or he would be considered for Olympic participation, but points of contention remained over the organizational implementation of such improved relations:

The President likewise indicated how non-white sportsmen could improve their standards of achievement and offered all the assistance available to the [South African National Olympic Committee]. The representatives of the South African Sports Association indicated that they would not be satisfied with any form of parallel affiliation with the National Governing Bodies of Sport, and would maintain their opposition to the [South African National Olympic Committee] unless integration from club level up was forthwith enforced. This is clearly quite beyond the purview and powers of the [South African National Olympic Committee].... The Executive of the [South African National Olympic Committee] wishes to point out that the greater majority of non-white sportsmen are

enjoying the benefits referred to above through their affiliation to the existing National Governing Bodies of Sport.⁵¹

The objective of all this was to demonstrate the growth of non-white participation in sport, but SASA's constant dissatisfaction was impossible to ignore, and the initial goodwill diminished such that two months later Francey complained to Brundage about being ignored by SAN-ROC, and the latter's inappropriate use of the term 'Olympic.'⁵²

In his first letter to newly elected SANOC President Frank Braun, Mayer remained unsympathetic towards SANOC's position: "[M]ay I tell you that following the press, I read that the racial discrimination in your country is still worse than ever. That makes me think that in Sport one follows the Government's instructions too?"⁵³ The unauthorized use of Olympic symbols by organizations such as SAN-ROC, likewise, was a consequence of the flawed political regulations in place in South Africa: "If you had a law in South Africa forbidding unauthorized organizations to use the Olympic words and symbols, such as there are in the United States and in other countries, you would be able to take action against SAN-ROC."⁵⁴ Francey, in response, insisted on the "tremendous progress" made by non-White sports organizations that had affiliated to the national sports organizations: "Where athletes are accepting affiliation, help and guidance from the official National Sports Federation, they are making excellent progress."⁵⁵

Mayer acknowledged the difficulty of pursuing a solution without involving SANOC in political dealings, a foundation of the IOC's approach to keep sport and politics apart: "... if the South African Government issues laws of racial discrimination, I don't think that you can go against them in spite of the fact that you don't wish to mix

politics to sport.”⁵⁶ Instead, Mayer mooted the possibility of coming to an arrangement in the area of sports exclusively, through a rapprochement between SAN-ROC and SANOC: “I am sure that you have no difficulties with the Non-white sporting bodies who have affiliated to your National Sports Federation But I think that all your efforts should be put in the view of having ALL the Non-White National Bodies affiliating to the existing Organization. Why does the SAN-ROC remain in its position? Is it not possible to include their leaders into your Organization?”⁵⁷

Despite their criticism, both Mayer and Brundage wanted to aid SANOC, putting the issue on the agenda of the upcoming session in Nairobi, where the IOC hoped to receive a report from SANOC that would restore its standing. “[D]on’t forget that we must have strong arguments in your favour and that we have to expect several interventions on the subject,” Mayer advised, “do mention also in your Report how many National Bodies have included Non-Whites and how many not, while mentioning the name of those Federations.”⁵⁸ To assist SANOC reclaim its place as a legitimate IOC member, Mayer gave permission to send the President, one delegate, and two observers to the upcoming meeting in Nairobi.⁵⁹ Francey showed herself appreciative of Mayer’s good faith, but could not hide her concerns regarding the plans of SAN-ROC, pointing to one John Harris’ hope to attend the meeting on behalf of SAN-ROC, and place “their propaganda before your members. Great play is being made in certain newspapers of the fact that this SAN-ROC representative has managed to get in ahead of us with an address to the IOC, and has been able to side-step my Association, which is your official representative in this country... My Executive Board has the greatest confidence in your handling of this gentleman and his unofficial

approach to the IOC, especially after his London representatives have been told that the IOC will not receive them at its meeting.”⁶⁰

It was obvious that SAN-ROC's unilateral action concerned Francey, who bemoaned the lack of co-operation between the two organizations, “an appeal to them to work with us in achieving the above aims [the development of sport in South Africa] was refused.”⁶¹ The whole issue, Francey argued, could have been laid to rest if SANOC's earlier offer of co-operation for the non-white organizations had been followed through on: “At that time the whole question was one of affiliation, and a promise was made to your President and members that all athletes of Affiliated Bodies would be considered in every way for equal privileges as members of South African teams, provided they belong to affiliated sports and reach international standards.... I take this opportunity of placing on record once again that everything possible is being done to encourage the affiliation of non-white groups to the recognised Governing Bodies of Sport...”⁶² In his response, Mayer pointed out that the meeting between IOC members and John Harris, the SAN-ROC representative, had been of an informal nature only:

In spite of the fact that we asked the SAN-ROC Organization to send no representative to our Lausanne Olympic meetings of June 5th and 6th, the South African Non-Racial Committee delegated Mr. Harris who arrived on the eve of our meetings. I informed him that he could not meet the IOC Executive Board, because the problem of South Africa was not on the agenda and would only be discussed in Nairobi, after the recognized South African [National] Olympic Committee would have sent us a report.... Mr. Harris insisted and waited for hours behind our meeting room. After the meeting was closed, we agreed out of courtesy and owing to the fact that Mr. Harris had made such a long journey, to let him talk for 5 minutes when our meeting was over. Several members of the Executive Board had already left the room and therefore Mr. Harris was not received officially and no mention about his presence will appear in our minutes. Mr. Harris

spoke for about three minutes and handed over some documents to the members still present.... I wanted you to know the truth which seems to have been distorted by Mr. Harris when he gave information to the press.⁶³

The IOC's fairly cooperative stance towards SANOC notwithstanding, Brundage himself soon thereafter increased the pressure on SANOC to reach a solution of the issue, advising Francey that "unless you can produce evidence that it is possible for you to comply with Olympic regulations ... the International Olympic Committee would be forced to remove your name from the list of recognized Olympic Committees."⁶⁴ Francey reassured Brundage that SANOC was in a position "to present acceptable evidence to show that we comply fully with all Olympic rules."⁶⁵ Mayer offered the additional suggestion "that you bring along some of those coloured or negro men with your delegation to testify what you have done in providing facilities, coaches, etc. It may help in your case to have some negro testimony."⁶⁶ At the same time, he acknowledged that South African race legislation which rendered the mixing of white and non-whites illegal, ultimately over-ruled any arrangements the sports organizations might have attempted. "I think," he concluded, "that it would not be a wise politic from us to suspend the present Olympic Committee in South Africa. It would make more trouble than good."⁶⁷

In fact, he suggested, based on a tendentious report from Swiss journalist Rudolph Balsiger, that "the coloured men seem to be very happy there although, personally I am against any discrimination in sport. One thing I don't like there is that difference they make between whites and coloured men, where training in sport is concerned. Why don't they mix them together? Of course there are Government Laws against which nothing can be done." ⁶⁸ Mayer's message to Brundage thus was somewhat

ambiguous, on the one hand rejecting racial discrimination, while at the same time making a case in SANOC's favour based on Balsiger's report.

Permitted to go anywhere and meet with anyone, Balsiger's report was initially confidential, but he decided to make it public, since the facts as he saw were at great variance with other representations of the issue appearing in other print sources. Balsiger was clearly pro-SANOC, pointing to the development of sports activities among non-whites that had commenced over 10 years previously.⁶⁹ His published report included a brief historical synopsis in which he made light of "the 'Apartheid'", noting that its depiction in the media was "far away from the truth." Apartheid according to Balsiger was, in fact, not a discriminatory regime, but the,

... separate, calm and systematic development of the white and the Bantu, each group within its own geo-political homeland, according to inherent characteristics and talents. Both races are far apart in cultural, ethnographical and social-political ways and a joint development of the two is completely out of the question. ... The difference between the primitive culture of the Bantu and the Atomic Age is so great that no resolutions of the UN Security Council, threats of boycotts or decisions to suspend (IOC) would do any good or have any constructive value. ... Apartheid in Sports favor Black and Colored [sic]. Anybody who knows anything about the young African countries can readily see that the living standard of the Black in South Africa is far higher than anywhere else."⁷⁰

Mayer used Balsiger's report to cast doubt on SAN-ROC's position as a genuine sports organization, referencing Balsiger's opinion that "SAN-ROC [was] trying to infiltrate the sports with politics to make the South African sports a tool of some shady political ambitions. ... The 'representations' are a document which would not originate from a sports authority but rather originate in the kitchen of the communist party."⁷¹ Balsiger was convinced that should SAN-ROC succeed at the IOC, the present financial support for "the Bantu sports would stop immediately. The victims would

only be the Black[s] themselves.”⁷² Mayer concluded with a rhetorical question that may have implied his concurrence with Balsiger:

Is it not an insult to the Olympic idea when a small number of opportunistic politicians who exploit the present insecurity which could have possibly been caused by the IOC decision in Moscow. ... South Africa will be thrown into chaos and anarchy if Apartheid [sic] is not maintained. Maybe 100 years from now the Bantus will be able to provide the necessary understanding to share equal responsibilities. A racial unity is much easier achieved in sport, especially when all political influences are kept from it.⁷³

Mayer himself remained ambiguous about the content and direction of Balsiger’s report, but its public release just prior to SANOC submitting its own report, must have seemed fortuitous for the South African organization.⁷⁴ SANOC’s own report detailed its claimed progress and current position on South African sport. The report resulted from the resolution at the 1962 IOC General Session in Moscow and two subsequent letters by Mayer and Brundage, written in June 1962 and August 1963, respectively.⁷⁵

SANOC’s report included its interpretation of the Moscow resolution:

From the aforementioned Resolution taken in Moscow and the letters ... it would appear that there is no charge or allegation that the South African [National] Olympic Committee is responsible for any breach or disregard of Fundamental Rule No. 1. It is gratifying to note that the South African [National] Olympic Committee enjoys the confidence of the International Olympic Committee. We take this opportunity to re-affirm that it has always been and still is the policy of the South African [National] Olympic Committee to abide by this rule ... It would appear, however, that the International Olympic Committee is under the impression that Governmental prohibitions limit the freedom of action and prevent the observance by the South African [National] Olympic Committee of this Olympic Rule.⁷⁶

An ambiguous position emerged from the report. SANOC argued that it had not breached Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter*. It was ‘governmental prohibitions’ that were seen as the cause of the problem, but, in reality, “... there [was] no justification

nor any valid basis for the charge made against the South African Government.”⁷⁷ To justify its claims, SANOC cited three examples as evidence. First, a statement had been made by the Minister of the Interior on 18 January 1963: “Should there be Non-Europeans who qualify for inclusion in the South African contingent which will participate in the next Olympic Games, application for travelling facilities should be made in good time, and each application will then be considered on its own merits and in the light of Government Policy.”⁷⁸ This statement did not directly identify discrimination against participation, but it did not specify what ‘government policy’ might entail; the latter, as the IOC well knew, underscored racial discrimination. Second, the report listed a variety of international events that had been held where both South African whites and non-whites participated: (1) boxing in Rhodesia (December, 1961) and the U.S.A. (March, 1963); (2) athletics in Britain (July, 1963); and (3) weightlifting in Stockholm and the Mr. Universe contests (September, 1963). Unmentioned, however, were occasional controversies at these international events, such as the case of black weightlifter Precious McKenzie, who qualified to compete, but due to his refusal to join an association affiliated with SANOC, was not invited to the competition. Third, obtaining passports and international travel was mentioned as encountering no difficulties, but individual decisions remained entirely at the whim of the government. Those athletes and sporting personnel who did not receive clearance were not allowed to leave the country.

The second significant issue emphasized in SANOC’s report was the adherence to IOC rules and regulations. It was established IOC principle that the IOC did not interfere with the internal policies of countries, and that its chief concerns were the

maintenance of amateur regulations and the rejection of exclusion from participation for racial reasons. SANOC reaffirmed that athletes selected on merit and with proper affiliation would be included in the coming Olympic Games. A complete list of bodies affiliated to SANOC, each of which provided for the inclusion of non-white associations, was provided. Also specified were the non-white organizations of Olympic-type sports, each of which had affiliated to the national controlling bodies.

Thirdly, the issue of material and financial support was raised. SANOC argued that “[c]onsiderable financial assistance has been made available both by Government and Local authorities, as well as by private industry, particularly the mining industry, to the non-white South Africa sportsmen for their benefit and welfare.”⁷⁹ Therefore, the organization concluded, “phenomenal advancement and improvement in the various branches of sport in which the non-whites are interested has been accomplished in recent years.”⁸⁰ Multiple examples of assistance that, in SANOC’s view, benefited non-whites in sport, were listed.

SAN-ROC, unsurprisingly, but also some IOC members remained dissatisfied with SANOC’s report, and Brundage invited a select group of IOC members to join him for a conference on 16 October 1963, to discuss the South African question.⁸¹ Resolution proposals were drafted by Sir Arthur Porritt (New Zealand),⁸² Mr. Alexander (Kenya),⁸³ Mr. G.D. Sondhi (India),⁸⁴ Mr. Massard (France),⁸⁵ and Marquess of Exeter (England),⁸⁶ and the Baden-Baden IOC General Session minutes reported that SANOC did not move from its position: “The [South African] delegation frankly states that apartheid is no business of the IOC. Anyhow: Non-whites can train together with whites and competitions can also take place between them outside South Africa. If

non-whites qualify they will be nominated to the team.”⁸⁷ Resistance to South African participation therefore, so SANOC argued, was stirred up by “political agitators.”⁸⁸ The IOC noted “that important progress had been made,”⁸⁹ but it remained unconvinced. The final resolution was carried by 30 to 20 votes; it instructed SANOC,

... to make a firm declaration of its acceptance of the spirit of the Olympic Code and in particular of Principle 1 and Rule 24 read together, and must get from its Government by December 31st 1963 a change in policy regarding racial discrimination in sports and competitions in its country, failing which the South African National Olympic Committee will be debarred from entering its teams in the Olympic Games.⁹⁰

The threat of South Africa’s suspension had now been formally raised. To ensure participation in the 1964 Tokyo Games, the obligation to fulfill the requirements of the resolution now clearly rested with SANOC. SANOC representative Reginald Honey was present at the decisive meeting and voted on the resolution, and SANOC president Braun had a conversation on the issue with Brundage, but Braun claimed nonetheless that no official statement had been issued on South African participation. Although taken aback by this claim, Mayer acknowledged a potential miscommunication and volunteered to “extend the delay to January 15th 1964 [i.e., two weeks].... If I missed to follow the right line, I regret it and apologize.”⁹¹ Mayer pointed out to Brundage that SANOC’s “silly excuse not to reply in time” had been seized on by SAN-ROC: “My sources of information are: A telephone call from the DAILY MAIL, LONDON and a cable from that silly HARRIS chairman of SAN-ROC which I received this morning, saying this: ‘Mr. Braun claims South African [National] Olympic Committee has had no official notification of Baden-Baden decision and is therefore not bound to report to IOC. Urgently request you do not allow this evasion’.”⁹²

In the official letter withdrawing South Africa's invitation to the Tokyo Games, the IOC cited the reasons for the retraction and listed the conditions under which SANOC would be reconsidered for participation in the Olympics. First, proper trials for selection of a truly representative South African team had to take place. Second, SANOC had an obligation to disassociate itself from government policy, which, the IOC determined, SANOC had failed to do. Lastly, once SANOC had carried out its duty arising from Article 24 of the *Olympic Charter*, the IOC would reconsider its participation in the Olympic Movement.⁹³

Undeterred by the IOC General Session's decision, Braun continued to argue for SANOC's participation in the Tokyo and later Olympic Games, assuming that the retraction of the invitation had not been decided on lightly since "... it would create a precedent which could have very far-reaching repercussions upon the ideals of the Olympic Movement itself."⁹⁴ Probably attempting to delay, as was part of SANOC's plan, he reiterated SANOC's argument that significant progress had been made in South African non-white sports, and that the IOC's decision could only have adverse effects: "... we have opened the door from within, and now it may be shut from without."⁹⁵

The resolution's fundamental rationale, Braun argued, focussed directly on governmental policies, and as such it was misdirected: "It is regrettable that the opponents of South Africa should have sought to exploit the Baden-Baden Congress as a political arena by making athletes political hostages to force 'a change in policy regarding racial discrimination in sports and competitions in their country'."⁹⁶ The implications of the resolution might therefore well be detrimental to the functioning

of the IOC itself: "... your resolution creates a very dangerous slope on which to place sport and is tantamount to requiring us – the sportsmen and athletes of South Africa to enter into Politics – NOT MERELY TO OPPOSE BUT TO DENOUNCE OUR GOVERNMENT.⁹⁷

The South African government declined to consider a policy change, but reaffirmed its stated position, viz., that any athlete selected on merit would be given the opportunity to participate in the Tokyo Games. Braun used this reaffirmation to ask for "a little tolerance and goodwill and a measure of sympathetic co-operation," and pleaded for a deferment of action until after 1964 Tokyo Games: "The test of the sincerity and bona-fides of my Association and the success of its efforts in upholding Olympic Principles will be in the manner in which we deal with our country's participation in the forthcoming Tokyo Olympic Games. My Association will faithfully abide by the undertakings given by me at Baden-Baden to bring to the Olympic Games the best athletes in this country, regardless of race."⁹⁸ Braun may have taken comfort from the fact that the decision had by no means been unanimous. A vote of 30-20 in favour, with three abstentions, demonstrated a significant remaining base of support for SANOC. Braun certainly felt inclined to thank the Marquess of Exeter, for one, for assistance given: "...we especially thank you for the outspoken and fully justified sentiments.... Your comments on the resolution bring home very clearly with striking force, that this Resolution in its present form, if carried into effect, will achieve nothing except to exclude and sacrifice athletes who are in no way responsible for, nor can in any way bring about any change in Governmental policy."⁹⁹

In his correspondence with the IOC, meanwhile, Braun pursued SANOC's customary line of reasoning. He claimed as before that significant developments in non-White sports had been brought about by the organization, which would be put at risk by the exclusion of South Africa; all that was required was more time to bring to fruition a strategy that was, furthermore, constrained by the fact that SANOC was not in a position to override official South African government policies: "I beg to suggest that with further similar help and encouragement from the IOC more will be accomplished in this direction. ... Drastic action at this stage by the IOC would be in conflict with the Olympic Ideal and would not contribute towards the eventual successful outcome of our efforts, but on the contrary it would defeat its very purpose."¹⁰⁰ In a personal note to Brundage, Braun then added a new argument, pointing to South Africa's being "strongly represented" at the Tokyo World Paraplegic Games, giving rise to the "anomalous position ... [of being] absent from the premier sporting festival the next week; where the flower of South African sportsmen have participated since 1908 with distinction, and honoured all Olympic rules and regulations without incident of any sort."¹⁰¹ Faced with expulsion, Braun recalibrated SANOC's approach, expressing contrition about the style of his interactions with the IOC without admitting to doubts about the organization's arguments, pointing out that his occasionally perhaps intemperate interventions had been fuelled by "a sense of frustration and also a deep sense of disappointment, which I feel at the injustice that will be done to our Non-White athletes, in particular, and to our other young sportsmen if they are deprived of the opportunity of marching with pride and dignity alongside the other athletes of the world."¹⁰² His concluding missive reaffirmed

contrition by assuming a supplicatory posture: "If you feel that the presence of a South African delegate at Innsbruck may serve some purpose, please advise me as soon as possible so that arrangements can be made in good time."¹⁰³ Both Mayer's and Brundage's responses were conciliatory. "It will do no harm and possibly some good if you have a representative at Innsbruck,"¹⁰⁴ wrote Brundage, but the IOC meetings at Innsbruck would place a damper on Braun's and SANOC's hopes. The IOC Executive Board noted an overall lack of progress, and a failing on SANOC's part publically to dissociate itself from South African government policies. Brundage "...noted some progress but [said] that the promises from Baden-Baden had not been kept. The other members said that SANOC had not carried out its obligations.... A resolution to that effect would be proposed to the Session."¹⁰⁵ At the General Session, the same conclusion was reached: "The resolution passed at Baden-Baden still stands and the invitation to the South African team to compete in Tokyo is withdrawn. When the SANOC has carried out its duty under rule 24 it will then be in a position to return to the IOC for reconsideration of the decision."¹⁰⁶

Undaunted, Braun continued his efforts to promote SANOC and to publicize improvements in the current status of sport in South Africa. In an official statement to the IOC Executive Board, SANOC reaffirmed the acceptance and recognition of Article 1, including "...the principle that complete equality of opportunity shall be afforded to all citizens of the Republic of South Africa to compete in the Olympic Games."¹⁰⁷ Complying with Article 24 was not an issue since all prospective contestants were entitled to compete for the South African Olympic team by meeting the necessary standards. A list of nominations for the forthcoming Olympics – comprising both non-

whites and whites – was provided and final team selection was to be made in collaboration with administrators of both white and non-white sports bodies affiliated with SANOC; all athletes selected would be issued the same South African Olympic colours. With such assurances in place, SANOC implied, the onus now rested with the IOC, not SANOC: “... it now rests with the International Olympic Committee Executive to decide whether non-whites from this country shall be given an opportunity of participating in the Olympic Games, or if this privilege is to be denied to them.”¹⁰⁸ Braun followed up this strategic shifting of responsibilities by attempting to rationalize SANOC’s position that despite the strictures posed by South African race politics, the organization was in the forefront of non-white sports development:

Whilst we do not denounce present policy in South Africa, it must be obvious to you and the Gentlemen of the Executive Board that more is being done in this country for the Non-white Sportsmen and sports women than in most other parts of Africa. And whilst we do not in any way wish to point a finger at any of our opponents, we bring to your attention the fact that tremendous strides have been made with Government help to furnish our Non-white community with modern facilities of every description, so that the standard of their sport can be raised to heights which will help them to aspire to Olympic honours.¹⁰⁹

It was, in this interpretation offered by SANOC, thus the IOC and not SANOC itself who had “to realise that it has a very responsible decision to make for the furtherance of our non-white athletic aspirations”¹¹⁰ – by admitting the South African team to the Tokyo Olympics.

Braun followed up on this theme. He also wrote to Brundage under the same date, attempting to demonstrate to Brundage the loss that South African exclusion would entail, by submitting a provisional selection of a proposed Olympic Games team that would attend the Tokyo Games. This, he wrote, was to demonstrate that SANOC had

“nothing more at heart than the progressive development of Non-white sport in South Africa to bring it to the standard of white sport and into the sphere of international competition. With the magnificent facilities being provided by the Government, Local Authorities and private sources, together with the expert coaching provided, it is already evident that great heights can be reached by our Non-white athlete.”¹¹¹ And the IOC would share in the international approbation incurred by such a development, “you and your Executive will have reason to be proud of the part you have played in furthering your Olympic Ideals in South Africa.”¹¹² According to Braun, the best course of action was to include South Africa in the upcoming Olympic Games:

There is nothing to be gained by preventing the South African Team, which will include the selected Non-white athletes, from competing at Tokyo, but far more will be achieved along the lines requested by you if these sportsmen are given the opportunity to travel to the next Olympic Games as representatives of South Africa.... Knowing that you have always had our interests very sincerely at heart, I leave the further consideration of this matter in your hands with the greatest confidence.¹¹³

But following the IOC Executive Board meeting in Lausanne, little had changed in the IOC's position: “As the NOC had not publicly stated that it disassociated itself from the Apartheid [sic] policy the requirements of the resolution from [the] Innsbruck [General Session] have not been met. If South Africa has not done so before August 16 (= final date for the entries) their participation cannot be considered.”¹¹⁴ Frustrated, Braun now interpreted the IOC stance itself as indicative of discrimination: “Failure of the IOC Executive to restore our invitation to Tokyo would be tantamount to the [South African National Olympic Committee] and the South African athletes being made the victims of political discrimination.”¹¹⁵ Mayer returned the argument, locating the issue of political discrimination firmly in the South African system. “I very

much regret,” Mayer noted, “that you have nothing further to add to your last letter of June 20th. As I wrote to you, the Executive Board of the IOC, at its meeting of June 26th in Lausanne, confirmed the conditions decided previously and under which only your Committee might receive an invitation to take part in the Tokyo Games. Those conditions having not been fulfilled.... We certainly regret that your athletes are deprived of taking part in the Tokyo Games owing to racial discrimination in sport in your country, although we have done our best. There is certainly no political discrimination, as you say, in the IOC’s decision.”¹¹⁶ The IOC would not reconsider its decision.

2.1 The Unofficial Correspondence of Ira Emery

Subsequent to the 1960 Rome Games, Lilian Francey succeeded Ira Emery as Secretary General of SANOC. Emery attributed his defeat to the opposition of influential groups that had been antagonized by, as he noted, his endeavour “to have our colour bar question, insofar as sport is concerned, amicably settled.... I am firmly of the opinion, that through my efforts in this direction, certain elements in this country are annoyed with me through my persuasion in forcing these affiliations.... I am fully convinced that my efforts on behalf of the non-Whites have been the cause of my having lost the position of Secretary General which I coveted for so many years.”¹¹⁷ IOC member Reginald Honey, for one, concurred, and upon learning that Emery had not been re-elected as Secretary General, immediately resigned from SANOC.

Emery had lost his office, but not his interest in South African sports, and he offered Brundage his unofficial services: “If you would care at any time to write to me unofficially about the position regarding the non-whites and Whites, particularly in

regard to their travelling to international contests, I would be happy to give you confidentially, the true picture here, as I have always done in the past.”¹¹⁸ Since Emery maintained his domestic and international contacts, he, in effect, remained a valuable source of intelligence over the next three years approaching the 1964 Tokyo Olympic Games. From this position, he helped to assess the future of SANOC within the Olympic Movement. In addition to scores of letters with commentary, some five dozen missives were sent to Brundage or Mayer containing contemporary newspaper clippings. Emery’s unofficial correspondence offers important insights into the issue under consideration here.

About a month after his removal from SANOC, Emery entered into his correspondence with Brundage, appraising him of developments in the problematic between race and sports in South Africa. With him and Reginald Honey gone from the organization, he noted, “the extremists in our Association [i.e., SANOC] seem to have gained control, and much as I regret to say it, unless Mr. Honey and I can work underground as it were, the chances of mixed competitions in this country for trials for the Games in Tokyo will go by the board.”¹¹⁹ The hardening of SANOC’s stance could only lead to political backlash by the “non-European [sic] associations in this country [who] will make more strenuous efforts to force the issue not only in this country but with countries outside.”¹²⁰ In view of these developments, Emery remained skeptical about the probability of SANOC receiving much support at the subsequent IOC meeting: “mixed sport must come if we are to remain a member of the IOC.”¹²¹

Emery understood clearly what SANOC must accomplish in order to retain its membership in the IOC. He realized that the pressures from domestic resistance would only increase if no solution was found: "It would appear to me that this attitude ... will give a great lead to the South African Sports Association (the organiser of whom is Mr. Brutus) to carry on their campaign with countries throughout the world."¹²² Brundage also saw the political liability of the issue increasing: "Already we are receiving vigorous protests and it will be difficult to keep this subject off the agenda for our [March Executive Board] meeting [in Lausanne]."¹²³ Nonetheless, in view of the South African government's political stance, the issue would be difficult to resolve in the area of sports alone. "If we endeavour to arrange mixed sport now in this country," Emery replied, "the Group Areas Act (1960) will be put into operation by the Government, which most certainly will preclude us from having mixed trials in any branch of sport.... if [South Africans] are not permitted in the Olympic Games of 1964 there will be such a rumpus among the sport people in this country that it may mean a complete revision of the feeling towards mixed sport."¹²⁴ In particular so, as Emery noted, similar action might also be coming from FIFA, the powerful organization running international soccer (association football): "... the sporting public of this country will be so incensed, that it may force the issue [of interracial sports] with the present Government authorities responsible for the prohibition of such trials."¹²⁵ Then perhaps, he concluded a day later, "we will be able to come back honestly into the fold of the Olympic and Empire Games."¹²⁶ But this would only be achieved through reactions in South Africa to the actual exclusion of South African teams that would put pressure on the South African government, and "I still contend

that the actions taken by the various international Sports Federation against us will be the only way in which we can beat the colour bar in sport.”¹²⁷ The underlying issue, for Emery, was and remained the official policies of the South African government on race relations, and it might be possible to move ahead through intervention by international sports organizations:

Owing to Government regulations and the Group Areas Act, Whites and non-Whites may not compete in sport in the Republic of South Africa.... I am quite convinced that the [boxing] match organised in Rhodesia between Whites and non-Whites was occasioned only through threat of expulsion of South Africa from the International Olympic Committee owing to the colour.... As I pointed out to you previously, I am quite sure that if international sports associations demand competition in the Republic of South Africa of Whites and non-Whites, and not have to hold matches outside, this colour bar will be broken down as far as sports is concerned in the Republic.¹²⁸

Emery’s seasoned sense of the South African sport culture gave him a credibility acknowledged by Brundage: “I have read the clippings which you sent, with interest, and I hope it will be possible to find a solution to this thorny problem before too long.”¹²⁹ But Emery harboured no illusions concerning the difficulties of SANOC’s position: “I do hope that Mr. Honey can make the trip to Warsaw as I am afraid that there will be strong opposition to our competing at Tokyo if the case is not handled properly by somebody from this country. I know you will do all in your power to help us but sometimes it looks rather hopeless.”¹³⁰

Although outside of SANOC’s control, controversies such as the denial of training facilities to a visiting swimming team from Japan by the Pretoria City Council at the end of 1962,¹³¹ did not help matters. Emery was left to consider the negative impacts of such incidents for South Africa’s Olympic aspirations, but he looked for a silver lining: “You may recall that I suggested if a warning were given to South Africa, actions

of this kind will make it imperative for the matter to be discussed at Warsaw and may stop the agitation against multi-racial sports in this country.”¹³² The ban was lifted eventually, and Emery viewed other such incidents in the same light, pinning his hope on the South African sports system being stirred into action in response to the racial policies of the country. “You will see,” he advised Brundage, “that even very senior Government action is to be taken regarding the refusal of Pretoria to permit Chinese to play with Whites in soft-ball, and that the Police have warned Whites not to play football with non-Whites in Natal.... I am sure you will, and your Executive will realise that sportsmen in this country will eventually force the issue as far as multi-racial sport is concerned.”¹³³ Emery went so far as to speculate that a one-year suspension, though not an expulsion, for SANOC might serve as a corrective to spur the government into action – while still leaving sufficient time for South Africa to prepare for readmission to the Tokyo Games at the end of such a period.¹³⁴

For Emery thus, SANOC’s position remained in doubt because of what he viewed as the uncertainty over the country’s political direction. He was disappointed by the statement on mixed sport by the Minister of Interior, Jan De Klerk, when the latter was asked to assess the impact for SANOC’s continuing membership or expulsion from the IOC, of the incidents mentioned above, “... this final statement by the Minister ... cut the ground away from my feet and there is little more I can do. I doubt also if your representative in this country, Mr. R. Honey can do anymore.”¹³⁵ Both Emery and Honey were approached by the press to comment on the statement by De Klerk. For lack of a better option, Honey, so Emery noted, resorted to SANOC’s stock reponse: “The only statement Mr. Honey was prepared to make was that he did give an

assurance to the International Committee that if a non-European was up to standard he would be sent.”¹³⁶ What was really needed, Emery thought, were changes to the Minister of the Interior’s statement and thus a policy change, but those did not appear to be forthcoming.¹³⁷

Public debates in the media regarding the necessity for a change in government policy on the issues of racially segregated or unified teams, and the permission of non-white athletes to travel abroad, came to the fore during the subsequent days. Emery informed Brundage of the scope of this discussion, ranging from a call for a clear shift in race segregation policies to the endorsement of a team selected solely on athletic merit and allowed to travel overseas regardless of colour.¹³⁸ Ultimately, Emery noted, any political strategy leading to the debarment of the South African team would “upset many, many people in this country including ardent supporters of the present Government. Sport is a very strong cog in the wheels of this country.”¹³⁹ Ultimately, however, Emery admitted, that SANOC’s hands were tied unless the Minister changed the government’s stance of outlawing mixed sport in- and outside the country.¹⁴⁰ This, as he had observed already, could more likely be effected by IOC action than any pressure the internal opposition might be able to muster. His review for Brundage of an abundance of new items in the South African papers on the issue, did not change his earlier evaluation: “My feeling is that if we are suspended from the IOC until such time as a modification of the statement is made, such modification will be made sooner than one expects.”¹⁴¹

Brundage shared Emery’s overall view, but considered the effects of this situation on the IOC: “This will undoubtedly force the International Olympic Committee to take

action, since we are under pressure from many quarters.... The situation in South Africa now seems to be a definite violation of our fundamental principle against racial discrimination. We have been lenient enough, I think you will agree.”¹⁴²

The IOC's range of options was increasingly restricted with every racial discriminatory comment by the government and SANOC'S inability or unwillingness to respond, but Brundage was not in favour of a two-team solution suggested by Emery: “I am sure the IOC will not approve two separate teams from any country. However, it might be that a South African team could be sent in two sections, but even this would be difficult to arrange. ... Unless the Committee is assured that its rules and regulations are going to be followed in South Africa, it is almost certain that drastic action, which I regret, will have to be taken.”¹⁴³ SANOC's suspension seemed unavoidable by then, particularly so since that even if a two-team approach had been acceptable for international events, it would simply have been illegal according to the legal regulations: “There is one thing that you can rest quite assured, that irrespective of whether the S.A. Government will allow non-Whites to represent South Africa overseas, they will never be permitted to take part in mixed trials in this country, as the Group Areas Act, which is law, will at all times be evoked, so preventing any trials whatsoever between Black and White in the Republic.”¹⁴⁴ An intermediate suggestion of sorts, to let the soon to be instituted quasi-independent Republic of Transkei (one of the Bantustans to be reserved for non-white populations) affiliate to the IOC, to balance representation of white and non-white teams. “This is so much utter nonsense,” Emery noted, “as the Transkei will always be governed by the Republic and the non-Whites from the Republic outside the area of the Transkei could never be

accommodated in that area.”¹⁴⁵ It is indeed true that throughout the almost thirty years of its existence, the Transkei (now a part of South Africa’s Eastern Cape province) was diplomatically recognized by just one country, South Africa.

Matters worsened, and internal tensions within the South African sporting community also increased. Opposition from Dennis Brutus and SASA was energized by a failure on the South African Amateur Athletics Union’s (SAAAU) part to nominate and select to the team two non-white athletes who had met the defined performance standards at the trials. SAAAU president, Mr. Marè, so Emery thought, had bowed to government pressure. “I have defended the various associations here against Mr. Brutus ... insofar as the standard of the non-White sportsmen was concerned.... I cannot honestly defend the S.A.A. Athletics Union any further.”¹⁴⁶ Not having official standing himself any longer, Emery urged the Marquess of Exeter to ask Mr. Marè at the subsequent meeting of the International Amateur Athletic Federation: why his assurances have been reversed; whether non-whites would be permitted to compete with white athletes in the Republic; and, whether non-white athletes would be permitted to have contests in places reserved for Whites?¹⁴⁷ Emery believed that SAAAU’s irresponsibility merited suspension from SANOC, “... I am afraid now that politics has entered into athletic sport in this country the suspension, not expulsion of the S.A. Athletic Union would, I am sure have a salutary effect on other Governing Bodies of sport in this country and in turn would have a very serious effect on the attitude of certain members of the Government of this country.”¹⁴⁸ None of this made conceivable the unproblematic acceptance of non-white athletes in a country where “certain people have been charged in the Magistrate’s Court for playing in a mixed

game, when the Group Areas Act ... was evoked.”¹⁴⁹ It would take the suspension of South Africa from international sports governing bodies to “get close to achieving the ideals of the International Olympic Committee sooner than one expects.”¹⁵⁰ The evasive position taken by SAAAU on the issue, which according to Emery, referred to “the many factors [that] had to be taken into consideration before the decision was made,” without elaborating on those factors could not obscure the underlying race-related reasoning.¹⁵¹ Emery was convinced that the non-white athletes had not been selected because of their skin colour, but SANOC President Gen. Klopper justified the decision, pointing out that although the non-white athlete had met the standard, the white runner had beaten his time in two different meetings.¹⁵² Therefore, athletic criteria alone had been applied.

As the IOC Moscow meetings drew nearer, de Klerk still showed no inclination to alter his statement about mixed sport, where Reg Honey was to represent South Africa.¹⁵³ Not wishing to impugn Honey who surely would not seek to mislead the IOC, Emery was nonetheless dubious about the veracity of the government information on the removal of restrictions on multi-racial sport reaching SANOC and thus Honey, via SANOC President General Klopper.¹⁵⁴ Klopper himself had made it crystal-clear “that over his dead body would non-Whites and Whites compete in trials against each other in South Africa,”¹⁵⁵ and Mr. Marè of the SAAAU had recently had to yield to political pressure in refusing to condone an inter-racial competition at a meeting to be attended by South African athletes in Lourenço Marques,¹⁵⁶ present-day Maputo, the capital of Mozambique; so much for the promise of international, if not internal, inter-racial sports competitions. The notion of mixed sports had to remain a pipedream.

With only twelve months to go until the IOC's final decision, the likelihood of inter-racial trials in South Africa remained extremely unlikely, a fact that SANOC's and Kloppe's prevarications did little to obscure. "I do not think that statements as made by Gen. Kloppe that non-Whites will be selected to represent South Africa in international sport (you will notice he has never mentioned the Olympic Games) can be relied upon".¹⁵⁷ The intractability of the South African political situation led Brundage to re-emphasize the primacy of IOC regulations in arriving at an adequate resolution: "I think you will agree that we were not as harsh as we might have been. We are not asking the Government to change its policies, all we require is that the Government permits the National Olympic Committee to function according to our regulations. If it is prevented from doing so, there is only one course we can take."¹⁵⁸

SANOC's expulsion seemed to be that inevitable course of action, and Emery concurred with Brundage: "I quite agree that the IOC were more than lenient with your South African counterpart, and I am equally certain the members of the South African body were more than surprised at the fair hearing given to your representative for South Africa, Mr. Honey."¹⁵⁹ However, Emery doubted that government attitudes would change before the deadline of the upcoming General Session in Nairobi. He remained convinced that mixed sport would never happen, insinuating that "... when the team is finally selected, even in two years' time, it will be found that the non-Whites are not up to the required standard."¹⁶⁰ Emery thought SANOC should ask the government whether the Group Areas Act could be set aside if non-whites demanded facilities and trials, and the government agreed to a mixed race team to represent South Africa at the next Olympic Games. "Unless the [South African

National Olympic Committee] can give this assurance,” expressed Emery, “then I contend, the matter should again be discussed by your Executive.”¹⁶¹ Brundage remained cautious, however, reluctant directly to involve himself in South African internal policy matters, insisting at the same time on the precedence of IOC rules: “Naturally we cannot interfere in the domestic affairs of any country, but we can enforce our own rules and this would prevent two teams from one country.”¹⁶² At the end of the day, if changes were not made to accommodate a single, mixed team, South Africa would have no team at all, and certainly not two. The fall-out of that decision, Brundage noted, would have asymmetrical impacts since the IOC would be “penalizing maybe 100 innocent white athletes for the sake of a handful of colored athletes. This doesn’t seem quite fair either, but we do have to hold our principles.”¹⁶³

Emery expected little help from the “non-European,” that is, non-white South African organization such as SASA who were under-organized, under-developed, under-funded, and, most importantly, they did not have “the sports bodies which are attached to the Olympic Games movement, and they will never have the finance to organise such an association. This latest attempt is quite ridiculous, and more than ever political.”¹⁶⁴ Neither was it likely that such under-powered organizations could be represented at SANOC by non-white representatives, an idea that had been mooted by new SANOC Secretary General, Mrs. Francey, creating a “considerable amount of embarrassment to the President of the Association, General Klopper.”¹⁶⁵

As the correspondence indicates, the situation did not improve in the subsequent months,¹⁶⁶ but by mid-November 1962 Brundage received an invitation to visit South Africa, all expenses paid by *De Vaterland*, a pro-government publication. He solicited

Emery's advice: "I replied that if and when I went to South Africa it would be at my own expense. Incidentally, would any purpose be served by such a visit? What do you think? Mr. Honey has been after me to make the trip, and as you know, I will be in Africa next year."¹⁶⁷ Emery was skeptical about the utility of such a trip: The government's position had not changed; neither would the arrival of Brundage lead to any accommodation of the opposing positions. The only possibility that offered itself therefore would be the nomination of two separate teams, a solution entirely unacceptable to the IOC. Moreover, since such teams also would have to be selected through entirely separate trials,

... each team [would] represent its own section of the populace, then your meeting in Johannesburg can, I think, be embarrassing to you.... Things however, may change between now and 1963/4.... Pressure is being brought to bear on certain Government officials which may eventually result in a compromise between White and non-White representatives on national bodies.... On the other hand, there are so many die-hards against this mixing, that I personally do not think the Government will change their decision at the present time.¹⁶⁸

Emery advised Brundage to visit Johannesburg, and Brundage set forth conditions to indicate his arm's-length distance from the South African organizations: "If I do come to South Africa, it will be after our meeting in Kenya and not before, and at my expense as I said before. After the South African [National] Olympic Committee has made its report, I will review the situation and decide whether it is advisable for me to make the trip."¹⁶⁹

Shortly after, in early 1963, Emery deliberated on the news that Sir Stanley Rous was to visit South Africa to end FIFA's, the world football (soccer) association's, suspension. When Rous did appear, there was a demonstration by non-whites demanding a fair hearing. "I do not know what views Sir Stanley will bring back to

England or pass on to you," Emery noted to Brundage, "but he is adamant that two associations will not be affiliated to the International Football Federation."¹⁷⁰ It was clear to Emery that Rous' visit had brought the issue of mixed as opposed to separate teams back into the area of public media debate: "I have had a private luncheon with certain Ministers of our cabinet and I am still definitely of the opinion that the Government will not permit a mixed team to compete in South Africa or outside the Republic,"¹⁷¹ Emery summarized the situation, but some suspense remained in regard to "Sir Stanley Rous' reaction to his meeting with the Non-Europeans."¹⁷² The press, Emery reported to Brundage, also took the theme up again, shining in this context again a light on the position of SAN-ROC, an inevitable aspect of any discussion concerning the possibility or impossibility of a mixed team: neither the government, nor the white and non-white public would accept the legitimacy of SAN-ROC, and thus of a mixed team. Emery thought that this could only lead to the expulsion of South Africa, unless SAN-ROC were to change "its attitude regarding segregation of sport, suspension must follow. The setup will be, as far as you are concerned, that South Africa will select one or two Non-Whites, whether they are up to standard or not, if South Africa is permitted to take part in the Games in Tokyo. This will of course be a blind [alley], as the non-Whites and the Whites will not travel as one team, nor will they enter against each other in any one event of the Olympic Games."¹⁷³

For Emery, it was obvious, the unlawfulness of mixed sports remained the intractable obstacle. As long as mixed sport was not allowed, SANOC's chances to participate in the 1964 Tokyo Games were nil. For Brundage, likewise, this remained "a difficult nut to crack,"¹⁷⁴ and although he assured Emery that the IOC did not expect

much of SAN-ROC, since it “would have no more success in organizing a satisfactory South African team than the South African Olympic Association, with the existing attitude of the Government,”¹⁷⁵ he at least did for the first time explicitly acknowledge the organization’s existence, in other words, a first reference to organized domestic resistance.

However, given the circumstances in South African sports, no organization could succeed in developing a non-racial Olympic team; equality of opportunity for non-white athletes simply did not exist, and the impetus for change would have to come from the outside: “This, in my opinion, is going to be the last wail from the non-Whites, because they will contend, and quite rightly so, that the Whites have far better facilities for their training and final competitions.... Mr. Honey has advocated that there should be mixed sport in South Africa, but I am afraid this statement has not been taken too well in Government circles or by the majority of the public.... It will only be through drastic action by the international sports Federations, that mixed sport inside and outside the Republic will be permitted.”¹⁷⁶

An unlikely solution briefly floated, one Emery was sure the IOC would also reject out of hand, would consist of “a suggestion ... made to you that if non-Whites are selected, they will represent the non-White population, and the Whites – the White population.... Only on these conditions will non-Whites be able to attend the Games.”¹⁷⁷ The strength of sentiment against any solution accommodating non-white athletes was indicated by the government-controlled South African Broadcasting Corporation’s refusal to broadcast the Natal Golf Open because it promoted multi-racial sport. Brundage responded that if a mutually satisfactory conclusion could not

be found, the IOC might be forced to take drastic action,¹⁷⁸ but to Emery it seemed that herein might indeed be found a resolution: "For some time now I have suggested that if drastic action was threatened against South Africa for its racial policy by the International Federations, it would force change. You have no doubt been advised that change in a manner has come about."¹⁷⁹ He offered as an example for the success of such a strategy that four white and four non-white boxers had been sent to Utica (New York) for a competition. They travelled on separate planes, but stayed in the same hotel. This was the first time this had happened in South African sport. To Emery, this represented a promising development, but he remained concerned that "applications will now be made for Whites and non-Whites to tour this country and compete in multi-racial sport, which the Government will not allow. I think that now you will not have to take such drastic action as was first contemplated and hope that the advent of the White and non-White boxers going to the U.S.A. will at least relieve some pressure on you."¹⁸⁰ Brundage was equally optimistic in his response: "Progress has indeed been made when South Africa sends both black and white boxers to take part in a tournament in the United States.... There is no reason why the same procedure cannot be followed in the Olympic Games, and this may well solve our problem."¹⁸¹

Brundage nonetheless sought to remain aware of all possible options to influence a difficult situation. SAN-ROC was an unknown entity, but in requesting more information from Emery, he indirectly acknowledged its existence as a possible part of a solution. Emery was skeptical: "... [Chairman] Mr. Harris is quite unknown in white sporting circles in this country.... I personally have never heard of him, and as far as this country is concerned, he carries no weight at all in international sport."¹⁸²

Brundage however, was insistent: "How many members has the South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee and how many people do they represent? Is it not true that they are more interested in politics than they are in sport? ... I hope we can find a more satisfactory solution at our meeting next month in Baden-Baden."¹⁸³ Emery dismissed SAN-ROC as representing "some thousands of non-White sportsmen, but I am quite certain they have never yet organized any particular function in sport."¹⁸⁴

The meetings in Baden-Baden ended with a formal resolution threatening the suspension of SANOC, if no solution could be found in due time. If it did not abide by the *Olympic Charter* in due time, a suspension would be inevitable. SANOC's progress was acknowledged, and even though "very few outside of those having political animus wanted to punish anyone," it would be necessary for SANOC "as an agent of the International Olympic Committee, to make a public expression of its position on the subject of racial discrimination. The choice was of keeping a few individuals out of the Olympic Games or of suspending the Committee, which would inhibit its activities."¹⁸⁵ Brundage and Emery alike were surprised to find Reginald Honey's public approach at the Baden-Baden meeting to be more hindrance than help. Emery expressed his shock "when my dear friend Reg. Honey gave his supposed outburst against the International Olympic Committee. I am quite sure he was mis-reported but nevertheless he seemed upset at the outcome of the discussions."¹⁸⁶ But Emery did not share even the slight optimism that Brundage had expressed; the political obstacles appeared unsurmountable: "I am glad you feel that the situation is not entirely hopeless but I must tell you now that the [South African National Olympic Committee] through its affiliated governing bodies of sport will not be able to hold

mixed trials in this country. There is a law against White and non-Whites taking part in boxing and wrestling against each other.”¹⁸⁷ Braun of SANOC, to the approval of the South African Minister of the Interior, also had expressed opposition to “the IOC’s ruling that multi-racial trials must be held in South Africa.”¹⁸⁸ Were a foreign athletic team ever to compete in South Africa, Emery concluded on a skeptical note, “no non-White would be permitted to take part against them.”¹⁸⁹ Brundage, looking for a positive, did not think that “the situation [was] entirely hopeless, but most certainly it will have to be handled very carefully if a satisfactory solution is to be found.”¹⁹⁰ He certainly was willing to remain conciliatory and consider representations on behalf of South Africa placed before the upcoming IOC meeting in Innsbruck. After all, it was not the IOC’s business “to keep people out of the Olympic Games – our business is to keep them in.”¹⁹¹

Yet Brundage could not have drawn much encouragement from the government’s response to the South African Paraplegic Games Association’s (SAPGA) request for clarification on the organization’s goal to include qualified non-white athletes on the South African team. The Minister of the Interior remained principally unyielding. It refused to sanction a single, multi-racial team, but stated that there “would be no objection to two teams going forward, one representing White South Africa and one representing Non-White South Africa ... [nor] to permit both racial group teams to travel in the same aircraft.”¹⁹² The Minister also voiced objection to two such racially divided teams competing against each other, should that circumstance arise during the competition. Brundage immediately rejected as “subterfuge” the attempt to mask the racial discrimination evident in the Minister’s response, in particular the thinly

veiled attempt to obfuscate it through accepting the possibility of fielding two separate teams.¹⁹³

The obstacles to the inclusion of South Africa remained, although an occasional small step forward could be observed, as Emery noted, for example, "... the awarding of Springbok colours to two non-white athletes who have been selected to tour overseas."¹⁹⁴ However, after attending a SANOC meeting, Emery came to see that racial integration was not to be achieved as long as SANOC insisted on quibbling over technicalities and the Minister of the Interior retained ultimate decision-making power:

Great play was made of the paragraph in the IOC constitution about whether or not the rules affect the country only when it reaches the Olympic Games and not concern itself with the internal workings of a country. ... I can assure you that a very genuine effort has been made to meet the requirements of the IOC by the sporting bodies, but the matter does not finally rest with them, as the Minister of the Interior will have the final say.¹⁹⁵

Emery hoped that efforts by other South African sporting bodies might move the Minister to change his position, especially since all South African sport associations except the SAAAU agreed that non-whites should be given Springbok colours when competing for South Africa.¹⁹⁶ If a broader inclusion of non-white competitors were to be achieved, it seemed to Emery, perhaps SANOC should have considered withdrawing from the Tokyo Games and investing the money in the provision of better coaching for both white and non-white athletes.¹⁹⁷

The quandary, in Brundage's view, was whether the decision rested with the political or the sporting organizations. Could the IOC's stance be seen as implying an intervention in South African political issues? Brundage, insisting on the separation

of sport from politics – the IOC’s standard position – thought not, and apportioned responsibilities accordingly:

I note that some of the newspapers seem to think we called upon the South African [National] Olympic Committee to denounce its Government. This, of course, is not the case at all, we simply asked them to state publicly that they believe in the Olympic principles of non-discrimination. If it were prevented from following this principle by its Government, of course, that is quite a different thing, and the South African [National] Olympic Committee cannot be censured for this reason There are two question here – one political and one sport, and the International Olympic Committee is trying to keep them quite separate and distinct. Unfortunately, this is one of those problems to which there is no answer that will satisfy everyone.¹⁹⁸

Brundage wanted to retain what he understood as the separation of sport and politics, as he had tried to do during the approach of the 1960 Rome Games. This remained difficult to accomplish, since, as Emery pointed out, internal disagreements structured the internal South African sports landscape. In principle, SANOC accepted the nomination of both white and non-white athletes for the Tokyo Games, but the Amateur Athletic Union withdrew a mixed team slated to enter the British Championships; the Minister of the Interior added that non-mixed teams would be allowed. Matters might come to a head at the next IOC meeting, where the “Afro-Asian group” might work towards South Africa’s expulsion. As a fall-back position, Emery again suggested to suspend, but not expel, South Africa, “as once the country is expelled, in my opinion, it will be very hard to be re-admitted, but under suspension the matter may be a far easier one when it comes to the 1968 Olympic Games.”¹⁹⁹

SANOC thus found itself in a delicate position, a fact not lost on Brundage: “We are doing our best to keep the sport and the political phases of this problem, separate, although, as you know, it is almost impossible. It is too much to expect the [South

African National Olympic Committee] to denounce its own Government, as many demand.”²⁰⁰ Though Brundage reassured Emery that the South African question would not be on the agenda, he emphasized that any member might raise the issue during the General Session.²⁰¹ Any campaign carried on by South African domestic resistance forces that might consider such an action, was not to be taken lightly because they had both the ability and resources to raise the South African issue anytime and anywhere.

3. Domestic Resistance

Trying to maintain momentum from measures taken during the period leading up to the 1960 Rome Games, domestic resistance proved just as persistent during the approach to the 1964 Tokyo Games. A few months after the 1960 Rome Games, SASA, once again, began engaging with the IOC on the South African issue. At a general meeting of SASA, the following resolution was developed for the upcoming Athens IOC General Session:

‘That the International Olympic Committee demand from the South African Olympic and Commonwealth Games Association an undertaking that it will immediately ensure that all its constituent bodies will offer membership to all South Africans on a basis of equality and that if the undertaking is not given, the International Olympic Committee expel the SANOC and offer membership to a non-racial South African Olympic Association which offers membership equally to all South Africans in conformity with the Olympic Charter.’ The South African Sports Association respectfully requests that this resolution be placed on the Agenda of the Congress and undertakes to supply conclusive evidence, if required, to show that the recognised Association discriminates against non-white South Africans on the grounds of racial origins in violation of the Olympic Charter.²⁰²

SASA sought change and progress in South African sport, but its lack of real influence served to diminish the force of the ultimatum it issued SANOC: "If the discriminatory conditions of membership offered to non-white sportsmen are not removed, the South African Sports Association, in the interests of true sportsmanship, will have no alternative but to ask the International Olympic Committee to take action and to instruct its affiliated international Sports Federation to do likewise." ²⁰³ Emery's response for SANOC served to ascertain where the true responsibilities rested: "The [South African National Olympic Committee] deals only with South African Governing Bodies of Sport who are affiliated to their individual international federations.... Your reference to the International Olympic Committee is noted and a photostatic copy of your letter is being sent to the IOC."²⁰⁴

Brutus obviously did not want SANOC to function as his intermediary with the IOC; he requested that a representative be allowed to speak on behalf of SASA at the next IOC General Session in June: "We do not feel that the member of the International Olympic Committee resident in South Africa can fairly present our case because he has already defended the existing racial discrimination in South African sport and advised non-white sportsmen to accept it as a 'compromise'."²⁰⁵ IOC Chancellor Otto Mayer denied Brutus' request, noting that "the problem of racial discrimination has not been brought on our Agenda," for the upcoming session in Athens. "As a matter of fact and contrarily of what you express in your letter," Mayer continued, "the Executive Board of the IOC has received a South African delegation of non-whites during the Rome Games with whom we held a meeting. It was composed by Rev. Michael Scott assisted by a non-white gentleman on one side, and by Mr. Reginald

Honey and Mr. Braun (chef de mission of the South African team) on the other side.”²⁰⁶

A general discussion occurred on that occasion, Mayer recapitulated, “and it was felt by the IOC representatives that the S.A. Olympic Committee had made every reasonable effort to implement the undertaking of Mr. R. Honey, given at Munich in 1959, to ensure that no competitor of requisite caliber was excluded from the South African team.”²⁰⁷ It surely could only have been a “misunderstanding” that had led SASA to put forward its request. Brutus responded by pointing to what he interpreted as an admission made by none other than Reginald Honey in an address to the South African Sports Association:

... that there was racial discrimination in the recognised bodies governing sport in South Africa and [that Honey] advised the non-racial sporting bodies to agree to a compromise with the governing bodies and accept racial discrimination.... The South African Sports Association is certain that this is in violation of the Olympic Charter and requests that Mr. Honey be required by your Committee to furnish an explanation and to explain the position to your Committee at its Meeting in June.²⁰⁸

Brutus also repeated his demand that SASA be allowed to report to the IOC meeting, but also tied his action to the political circumstances of the country: “In the event of our spokesman being refused travelling facilities by the Government, as has happened on a previous occasion, we request that you decline to accept a report from one side only and instead institute an impartial Commission to conduct a full investigation into the true position.”²⁰⁹

Over six months later, on 12 November 1961, Brutus, on behalf of SASA, again requested that, in view of the lack of any progress, the matter of racial discrimination in South Africa be considered by the IOC again.²¹⁰ He requested to withhold South Africa’s invitation to the 1964 Games until the issue had been investigated officially;

that the issue be placed on the agenda of the upcoming IOC meeting and that SASA be allowed to submit written or verbal evidence. "We will not rest content," he concluded, "until there is fair play for all South Africans and the Olympic Charter is faithfully observed by all National Sports Federation in our country."²¹¹

Brutus sought to increase the impact of this intervention by sending out an appeal to all NOCs, requesting support to remove racial discrimination and secure international recognition for all South African sportsmen. He stated that the IOC was requested to reopen the South African issue for discussion in future IOC sessions, since discrimination still existed and athletes were being prevented from participating in international competition.²¹² SASA, moving forward with its agenda for a meeting in February,²¹³ received growing international support from its supporters, among them John Rogers, the SASA representative in London, England, and also a member of the British Olympic Committee. Stated Rogers to Brundage: "I am sure that the now apparent seriousness of the position in South Africa in regard to discrimination in Olympic sport, is blatantly obvious to sportsmen all over the world."²¹⁴

Brundage and the IOC initially ignored Brutus and SASA's request to reopen the South African discussion. Failing to receive a response to a letter he sent to Brundage in November 1961,²¹⁵ Brutus reminded Brundage, yet again, of SASA's concerns to place the race discrimination issue on the agenda of the subsequent IOC meeting, and investigate SASA's complaints.²¹⁶ The IOC finally reopened the South African racial discrimination issue by calling for a report from SANOC. Brutus urged the IOC to accept a supplementary report from SASA: "As a co-ordinating body representing the

overwhelming number of South African sportsmen of all racial groups we believe that we can supply important information and that this would be essential in order to obtain an accurate account of the position in our country.”²¹⁷

The subsequent IOC Executive Board meeting led to a hardening of the IOC's attitude towards SANOC's position. President Brundage was “very disappointed as none of the promises made by the IOC-member Honey in Rome ha[ve] turned out as positive as he thought. It is decided to write the NOC and ask why. If no explication strong proceedings must be taken against South-Africa.”²¹⁸ Chancellor Mayer also noted the complete lack of progress on the issue: “...even the South African Government has stated last month again that it is against policy to permit any racially mixed sport anywhere in the Republic or to allow any racially-mixed teams to leave the country.”²¹⁹ Absent any noticeable progress, the Executive Board would be compelled to place the issue on the agenda of the upcoming Moscow General Session: “It may be that special measures might be taken towards your Olympic Committee, what we and you would like surely to avoid.”²²⁰

Otto Mayer maintained a dialogue with Brutus, noting that in regard to the supplementary report offered by Brutus, Mayer was willing to receive such a report from SASA if it was shared with SANOC. “As we heard,” Mayer said, “the situation seems to [be] improv[ing] and we sincerely hope that the racial discrimination in sport will disappear in the shortest delay.”²²¹ Mayer also wrote a letter to Lilian Francey, reminding her of SANOC's responsibilities.

This promising exchange notwithstanding, two months later Brutus used SASA's supplementary report to ask the IOC immediately to expel SANOC at the upcoming

IOC General Session in Moscow. The report contained the following charges, among others: SANOC condoned racial discrimination in organizations affiliated to it; neither SANOC nor its affiliated organizations had shown any signs of admitting non-whites to full and equal membership; SANOC would not oppose government race discrimination policies; increasing government interference in sports occurred in contravention of Olympic principles; the acceptance of “mixed teams of sportsmen, either inside or outside the country,”²²² was contrary to official government policy; principles of athletic merit, according to which qualified non-white competitors should have been selected to representative teams, had been disregarded; worse, “[n]ine sportsmen – white, coloured and Indian – are due to appear in court this month because they organised a football match on a non-racial basis on a ground ‘zoned’ for Indians.”²²³

While SASA thus pursued its strategies through official IOC channels, domestic resistance also served to widen the breadth of public exposure. SASA President G.K. Rangasamy befriended prominent Springbok cricketer, Owen Wynne. Wynne had requested a national sport convention during a recent interview, and Rangasamy suggested to him that an upcoming SASA conference would be a suitable venue in which to launch his idea, with SASA and SANOC as co-sponsors. This, Rangasamy claimed, would finally be a conference with broad representation since, SASA “... represent[ed] the overwhelming majority of the non-white sportsmen of the country, through their non-racial bodies, and can undertake to arrange their support.”²²⁴ In the context of these developments, SASA also attempted to position itself in direct competition to SANOC, announcing that it would reconstitute itself through

dissolution and subsequent reincorporation as the “South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee (SAN-ROC) ... and apply for membership of the IOC at its meeting in Nairobi in October, 1963.”²²⁵

Beyond advances pursued by each South African NSF and their corresponding ISF, staging the “Wynne Conference,” sponsored by both SANOC and SASA, demonstrated significant progress. SASA President Rangasamy wrote Honey to solicit support and coordinate the conference with SANOC. Furthermore, with the proposition to dissolve SASA in sight, Rangasamy suggested: “The time would therefore seem to be opportune for a convention to consider the formation of a single non-racial Olympic Association which would be truly representative of our country and which would remove the imminent danger of expulsion now threatening [the] all-white racialistic and unrepresentative Olympic Association.”²²⁶

While awaiting a response from Honey, Rangasamy circulated a letter to all NSFs in South Africa about the possibility of a national sport conference in October 1962. Ideas and support were welcomed because it was an opportune time to discuss the problems in South Africa and develop a solution: “We can save any section of our population from being excluded from the Olympics and we can ensure that all South Africans are represented on the basis of merit.... For this it is essential that we come together to speak frankly and to uphold the ideals of fair play which we profess to believe in.”²²⁷

Unexpectedly, Rangasamy received a seemingly conciliatory letter from Lilian Francey requesting a list of the sports associations affiliated to SASA, “[a]ssuring you that my Association has the interest of all amateur sportsmen at heart, irrespective of

race, colour or creed, in terms of the Olympic ideal, and that every effort will be made to ensure that no athlete of international standard in any Olympic branch of sport will be denied the opportunity of representing South Africa at the next Olympic Games.”²²⁸

SANOC’s request for information was aimed at remaining in control of South African Olympic sport, and, Rangasamy assessed Francey’s request for information as a delaying tactic. His response was curt: “I am inclined to state bluntly that your inquiries are one more attempt to stall: there has been no attempt on the part of your association to come to grips with the problem of racialism or to give frank answers to our questions.... I repeat my request that your Association should support a sportsman’s national convention and hope that this time we shall get a frank and direct answer.”²²⁹

Whether SASA really expected SANOC to cooperate on such a convention, remains doubtful. Brutus, for his part, certainly sought to leverage the possibility of forming SAN-ROC as a non-racial successor to SASA and replacement for SANOC at the IOC, in order to force SANOC to reach some form of understanding: “We have indicated that if all South African amateur sportsmen can be admitted to equal membership of the national bodies affiliated to the [South African National Olympic Committee], then we will not proceed with the development of a South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee (SAN-ROC).”²³⁰

On the same day, Brutus was similarly unequivocal in explaining the strategic purpose of the proposed new organization to Honey: “It was also agreed that SAN-ROC would agree to ask the [South African National Olympic Committee] to arrange talks on the question of admitting all South African sportsmen to equal membership

of its affiliated bodies.... On behalf of SAN-ROC I hereby submit the request for talks with your Association on the question of equal membership of all South African sportsmen in its affiliated national bodies.”²³¹ Brutus anticipated the subsequent January as the date for the formal inauguration of SAN-ROC, but, “if a satisfactory solution can be found,” he continued, “it is probable that it would be unnecessary to proceed with the development of SAN-ROC. It would therefore be most fruitful if our talks could be arranged before January, 1963.”²³² The responsibility to initiate discussions with SANOC devolved to Honey.

SASA kept up the pressure, and followed up with another letter to SANOC detailing the necessity of establishing SAN-ROC – unless the two organizations met to work towards the removal of racialism within South African sport. No reply had been received by early October. Another month passed, and SASA, interpreting SANOC’s non-reply as a stalling tactic, continued with the pressure:

Since it appears that we are not likely to receive a definite reply in the near future, in spite of my putting into your hands personally the information you said you required in your letter of the 9th November, I must advise you that this body and the South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee have no option but to press ahead with plans for building up a strong Committee and seeking membership of the International Olympic Committee at its Congress in Nairobi next year.... It is unfortunate that we should be compelled to do this. So much is entailed in the establishment of the Committee and in seeking membership of the IOC that we cannot afford to have any unnecessary delay: it is hard not to see the evasiveness of your body as an attempt to impede our work for the removal of racial discrimination and the achievement of true sportsmanship for all South Africans in the Olympic field.²³³

Since no constructive meetings were held between SASA and SANOC, SAN-ROC was officially formed on 13 January 1963. Its first order of business was to issue a letter that protested Sir Stanley Rous (President of FIFA) addressing members of the

IOC on the racial issue in South Africa;²³⁴ Rous was unfit to speak, since during his previous visit to South Africa, he had publicly come out in favour of the racial arrangements in South Africa.²³⁵ R. Hlongwane's (Secretary of SAN-ROC) address at the second biennial General Meeting of SASA, signalled that change was on the horizon, but that hard work was required to effect it:

In October of this year the International Olympic Committee will be discussing S. Africa. The racial Olympic body was given a warning last year and it has disregarded that warning. Now we must prove that they do not represent the country and that they do not carry out the Olympic ideals. But to strengthen our case, we must prove that the majority of our sportsmen are excluded from the racial body and that they are opposed to racialism.²³⁶

Hlongwane sent Brundage news clippings as evidence of the South African government's interference in all matters relating to sport, especially the Nationalist party's coercion of existing sporting organizations.²³⁷ The South African Olympic administration, however, was more concerned with the formal use of the term, 'Olympic,' than with engaging SAN-ROC on the substantive issues.

On 9 February 1963, SASA President Rangasamy responded to an earlier letter from SANOC requesting that SAN-ROC eliminate the word 'Olympic' in the organization's title. Not being a SAN-ROC official, Rangasamy could not resist the temptation to return the charge of illicit use of Olympic symbolism, while also letting SANOC know that SAN-ROC would only communicate with the IOC itself:

You are aware that we dispute the right of your body to use the title 'Olympic' since it openly violates the principles of the Charter of the International Olympic Committee and that we are preparing to raise this matter with the IOC ... I must also point out that SAN-ROC cannot recognise the jurisdiction of your body and will only act on a request from the International Olympic Committee itself. This is, however, a matter on which you will no doubt receive an opinion from SAN-ROC once you have directed your request to the correct questers.²³⁸

SAN-ROC President N. Rathinasany then followed up on this challenge to the legitimacy of SANOC, requesting from Brundage that the “question of racialism in South African sport be discussed at the Nairobi Congress of the IOC in October of this year and that the membership of the present body representing South Africa ... be questioned, since this body in no way checks the practice of racialism in the racial bodies affiliated to it.”²³⁹

Brundage gave assurances that the IOC was aware of the problems in South African sport, that they had been discussed previously and would be on the agenda at the next meeting, but he also curtailed communication with SAN-ROC on a technicality. He notified Rathinasany that the organization’s use of the word ‘Olympic’ contravened IOC regulations,²⁴⁰ and the IOC later “resolved that, whilst SAN-ROC uses the word ‘Olympic’ in its title, neither the International Olympic Committee nor any of its officials shall have any communication or dealings with it.”²⁴¹

Undeterred by such admonishments and resolutions, SAN-ROC continued to attempt to influence the IOC towards advancing its agenda. He asked Mayer to forward a letter to the Japanese Olympic Committee (JOC) requesting that the JOC withdraw its invitation to SANOC for the upcoming Olympic Games, ²⁴² since it was SAN-ROC’s “outspoken contention, which we can support with facts, that racialism has increased and is even worse than before in sport in our country.”²⁴³ Mayer grew exasperated at what he considered SAN-ROC’s overreaching approach: “It is certainly not [SAN-ROC’s] business to interfere in our affairs and to give orders to the Tokyo Committee!”²⁴⁴ SAN-ROC’s letter would not be forwarded to the JOC, but Rathinasamy sought an even broader audience, continually promoting SAN-ROC at the expense of

SANOC. In a May 1963 missive addressed to “all Olympic Committees and sportsmen,” Rathinasamy elaborated the organization’s position: Racial discrimination in South African sports was more deeply entrenched than ever: “There are now more bodies recognised by the South African [National] Olympic Committee which are composed exclusively of White South Africans only or Black South Africans only. Members of the two groups never compete against each other and thus there are no fair trials to select the best sportsmen to represent our land at international events such as the Olympic Games.”²⁴⁵ Those who sought an alternative to this situation by establishing non-racial sports organizations were not recognized by SANOC. In consequence, SAN-ROC had requested a hearing at the upcoming Nairobi IOC meetings. “We ask the sportsmen of the world,” Rathinasamy concluded, “to take note of this and to oppose racial discrimination in sport.”²⁴⁶

Avoiding the political implications of this missive, the IOC remained insistent on resolving SAN-ROC’s illegitimate use of the IOC’s trademark, referring to the race issue only in passing and casting doubt on SAN-ROC’s legitimacy: “The South African National Olympic Committee is still in good standing, although the subject will be discussed at our next Session at Nairobi in October.”²⁴⁷ In its own view, SAN-ROC’s existence as a formally constituted organization legitimized such interventions, a viewpoint it emphasized by forwarding to the IOC and ISFs a copy of its own constitution, on the subsequent day.²⁴⁸ Two months later, Rathinasany agreed nonetheless to comply with Brundage’s original demand and change the word “Olympic” in its name to “Open.” He pointed out, however, that SANOC used the word

illegitimately in a rather more substantively political sense, since its accommodation of racial politics amounted to a breach of *Olympic Charter* stipulations.²⁴⁹

The IOC was none too pleased with the determination shown by SAN-ROC as it pursued its agenda. SAN-ROC's representative John Harris had without invitation come to an IOC Executive Board Meeting in Lausanne in early June 1963. His insistence gained him "a few minutes – out of courtesy – after the meeting was over," which provided Harris an opportunity to achieve press visibility. "Mr. Harris' communication to the press was obnoxious,"²⁵⁰ Mayer responded with considerable irritation. SAN-ROC nonetheless attempted to position itself as the authoritative, best-informed source for the IOC on Olympic sports and racism in South Africa, requesting a visible presence "before the relevant meetings of the International Olympic Committee and its concerned sub-committees," at the October meetings in Nairobi.²⁵¹ Mayer at least did not ignore Harris' communication, but passed it on to Brundage.²⁵² Some weeks later, Dennis Brutus gave the argument a more explicitly political turn: white sportsmen and organizations who were complicit in Hendrik Verwoerd's imposition of apartheid, were guilty of racism, since no laws prohibited racially mixed sport – but sportsmen still imposed racial rules. The current system only allowed non-whites to affiliate with white organizations by maintaining inferior positions while still retaining segregated organizations – one white and one non-white.²⁵³ Brutus concluded with a call to "all true sportsmen to FIGHT RACIALISM. We ask them to demand the suspension of the racist South African [National] Olympic Committee. We ask them to stand firm and not permit racial discrimination to be tolerated in an organisation which is pledged to outlaw discrimination and to uphold the principles

of fair play and sportsmanship.”²⁵⁴ To reinforce the message, SAN-ROC representative Harris issued a similarly worded statement on the same day.²⁵⁵ SAN-ROC extended the message by suggesting that SAN-ROC rather than SANOC was the legitimate body for Olympic sport in South Africa, and by demanding the suspension of SANOC at the upcoming Baden-Baden meeting, “such suspension to remain in force until the SANOC can show that it grants affiliation only to controlling bodies which are in all ways non-racial.”²⁵⁶

These statements coalesced into a four-page document outlining the case for SANOC’s suspension: SAN-ROC argued that it could represent South Africa better than SANOC. SANOC had lost its legitimacy when it failed to speak out against both Brutus and Harris being detained in South Africa since the government did not want those who spoke out against racism to leave the country.²⁵⁷ SAN-ROC reiterated that in June 1962, the IOC had made a decision that if the policy of racial discrimination had not changed by October 1963, the IOC would suspend SANOC. Since then, the government had made, on 4 February 1963, a full statement regarding its policy on sport.²⁵⁸ Some of the notable points from that statement reinforced racial discrimination: (a) white and non-whites must play separately; (b) international mixed representation would not be approved; (c) non-white associations could exist alongside white associations, whereby one to two whites could represent the non-white association at the Executive Board level; however, if white representation was not practicable, a non-white could serve on the white committee; and (d) white Executive Boards could serve as a liaison between association and world organizations.²⁵⁹ SAN-ROC emphasized the two overarching ramifications of this statement: first, complete

segregation in sport was to be retained; second, overall control must remain with whites.²⁶⁰ The reality was, according to SAN-ROC, that South African policy had hardened since the Moscow meetings, not relaxed. Importantly, SANOC's compliance was voluntary because there were no laws prohibiting whites and non-whites coexisting on an organizational level. Therefore, segregation and racial discrimination by SANOC was in violation of Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter*. This warranted the suspension of SANOC until it could demonstrate an entirely non-racial approach.²⁶¹

A new development strengthened SAN-ROC's credibility. Harris wrote to Mayer noting that SAN-ROC had been invited by the Indonesian Minister of Sport to put together a team to compete in the Games of the New Emerging Forces (GANEFO), which was established as an Olympic Games alternative. Harris, not wanting to risk his position with the IOC, declined the invitation: "While strongly sharing GANEFO's opposition to all forms of oppression SAN-ROC is unable in terms of its constitution to accept your invitation.... We are committed to following the lead of the IOC, to the requirements of which we have at all times scrupulously adhered."²⁶² In copying Mayer on his response, Harris sought to improve relationships between SAN-ROC and the IOC: "We trust that our decision meets with your approval and that you will make our action known to those who will soon be considering the entire question of sports organization in South Africa. This particular piece of information should surely be known to those who will decide our fate at Baden-Baden."²⁶³

At the same time, SANOC issued a report detailing the progress of, and its current position on, South African sport. It is noteworthy that, before publishing a response, SAN-ROC representatives travelled to Baden-Baden attempting to arrange a meeting

with Brundage to hand-deliver a letter from Brutus.²⁶⁴ SAN-ROC's response focussed on several points. It interpreted SANOC's report itself as confirmation of the continued existence of racial discrimination, pointing among other indications to SANOC's lack of opposition to the South African government's unchanging policies, and to a letter by Balsiger in support of apartheid and included in one of the appendices.²⁶⁵ Then there was the simple obvious facts that organizations affiliated to SANOC still did not permit multi-racial competitions, and that non-white organizations seeking affiliation could still only do so from a position of inferiority: "This means, in fact, the exclusion of a great many of the best non-white sportsmen in South Africa."²⁶⁶ Then there was SANOC's contention that apartheid offered separate but equal opportunities – merely a convenient illusion, especially in regard to facilities: even the selection of competitors was to occur separately, without any competition between whites and non-whites. Lastly, Braun's report was disingenuous and misleading since, although white and non-white athletes were sent for competitions, they had to represent each faction separately, not as a combined team; mixed sport was not allowed.²⁶⁷

Some months later, Harris followed up with an open letter to the IOC Executive Board. He focussed on two aspects of the Baden-Baden resolution that, if followed, would improve the chances of SANOC's acceptance for participation in the Olympic Games: (1) SANOC's declaration of acceptance of Articles 1 and 24; and, (2) convincing the South African government to change its racial policy, and to work towards the elimination of racism in South African sports.²⁶⁸ This, however, was not sufficient; to motivate SANOC to seek real progress on the issue, Harris urged the IOC to suspend

SANOC for the time being: “ANY LESSER ACTION WILL REPRESENT ACCEPTANCE OF THE POLICIES AND ACTIONS OF A BODY WHICH ABSOLUTELY DENIES THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF THE OLYMPIC MOVEMENT.”²⁶⁹

SAN-ROC kept up the pressure to achieve South Africa’s suspension in a letter addressed to the IOC, some months later. The letter pointed again to what SAN-ROC viewed as SANOC’s voluntary compliance with “a policy of total Apartheid [sic] in South African sport. Mixed sport is not illegal in South Africa. Hence the South African [National] Olympic Committee could certainly make an immediate declaration of its own opposition to Apartheid [sic].”²⁷⁰ The fact that SANOC chose not to do so was “surely the clearest evidence of its own positive attachment to Apartheid [sic].”²⁷¹ SANOC should therefore be informed that, in addition of the retraction of its invitations to the 1964 Games, it would be expelled from the IOC unless it changed the policy of the sports bodies affiliated to it.

There can be little doubt that efforts emanating from the sphere of domestic resistance were considered in the IOC’s assessment of SANOC’s suitability to participate in the 1964 Tokyo Olympics. Part of the domestic resistance movement’s support network existed outside SASA and SAN-ROC, and indeed outside of South Africa. This added another dimension to the resistance’s wider recognition.

4. International Community

Almost a year after the conclusion of the 1960 Rome Games, the IOC received a letter from Antony Steel, Secretary of the Campaign Against Race Discrimination in Sport (CARDS), based in London, England. One of South Africa’s leading white cyclists had been suspended for riding in a match with coloured cyclists. When he was

summoned to appear before the board of the South African Amateur Athletic and Cycling Association, he was the target of a racial slur by one of the Board's members.

Steel was furious:

This association ... is a leading affiliate of the South African [National Olympic Committee] which you and your Executive protect continually. Writing quite personally it just makes me lose patience that your Executive is so ready always to find excuses to save the South African [National Olympic Committee] ... All that happens is that just before each meeting of the IOC the South African spokesmen say a few sweet remarks about their belief in inter-racial sport but the government makes it impossible or at least very difficult, but in between these IOC meetings this is the way they behave. You will observe that it is not the government which takes action ... but the South African Amateur Athletic and Cycling Union quite voluntarily. Perhaps you would like to ask that friend of the IOC Executive, Mr. Reginald Honey for his excuses this time.²⁷²

Steel's heated words were shared by many who desired change in South Africa. However, the IOC's Mayer thought some of Steels' remarks were too harsh: "I very much regret that I cannot agree with some remarks contained in your letter, when you say that our Executive Board protect the South African [National Olympic Committee] regarding the racial discrimination or when you mention that South African spokesmen say 'a few sweet remarks' etc.... I have informed you already that we had a joined meeting in Rome with the delegates of the South African [National] Olympic Committee and a Rev. Father together with a coloured gentleman. Full satisfaction was given to us."²⁷³

Mayer certainly was not oblivious to the energy of Steel's comments. In a private note to Brundage, attached to Brundage's copy of this letter, he offered a more far-reaching perspective on the issue than the IOC had ever stated publicly: "Dear Avery: Between you and me, don't you think that we should have suspended the South

African [National Olympic Committee] since a long time, as after all and in spite of all they tell us, there is a race discrimination in sport in that country.... Why should we not have the courage to suspend them?"²⁷⁴ This was the first time that a high-ranking IOC official questioned the organization's stance on the issue, albeit in a private. Mayer seemed to argue that harsher measures should have been applied to South African for its race discrimination. Was SANOC receiving preferential treatment, after all?

Less than a month later, Steel expressed a more ambivalent attitude about SANOC and its possibilities. Writing to Mayer, Steel included in his letter SANOC's reply to the Table Tennis Board as to why its athletes were refused passports to attend the world championships in China; SANOC elaborated that it was not customary to provide reasons for the refusal.²⁷⁵ Steel pointed out that mixed sport was not supported by the government which, in turn, prevented SANOC from honoring its promises made at the 1959 Munich IOC General Session. Passports would be denied to those non-whites who did progress towards international competition through white sport associations. Since only one organization, which, in South Africa was controlled by whites, was allowed to be affiliated with SANOC, and therefore to participate internationally, the IOC, in essence, endorsed white control of sport in South Africa.²⁷⁶ Noted Steel: "This is obviously completely contrary to the Olympic declaration and I would be grateful if you would bring these new vitally important facts that have just emerged to the notice of your committee for their consideration, for I just do not see how Mr. Honey can continue to argue the way he has done in the past, in the light of this evidence, and I hope that South Africa will finally be told to have its official sports associations open to all, irrespective of race, or else leave the IOC."²⁷⁷

Other international activists, such as John Rogers, SASA representative in London, and member of the British Olympic Committee, added their voice on the issue; the international response was clearly broadening: "I am sure that the now apparent seriousness of the position in South Africa in regard to discrimination in Olympic sport, is blatantly obvious to sportsmen all over the world."²⁷⁸ One Dr. André Ungar, Rabbi of Temple Emanuel in Westwood, New Jersey, also wrote to Brundage on behalf of Brutus, resending an earlier letter by Brutus, and providing Brundage with an elegant option to redress his earlier remissness in responding to Brutus:

I am forwarding to you another copy of a letter he had addressed to you some time ago. With South African postal and political conditions being what they are, it is quite possible that their letters to you – and yours to them – have been held up in the mail. It is, thus, as an additional precaution that this copy is being sent awaiting your kind attention.... I know, Sir, that your concern for the maintenance of the Olympic code that debars racial discrimination in international sport, will prompt you to take prompt and affective action in this matter. My own circle of acquaintances in the New York-New Jersey area, including American sportsmen and sports writers of note, supports the firm conviction that a very substantial amount of popular sympathy exists in this country for the cause of decency in South Africa's sport – above all on the international Olympic level.... Please let me know what steps I might further take to support Mr. Brutus' petition and the urgent and valid issue that lies beyond it.²⁷⁹

Even a growing segment of the South African population became more vocal on the issue. E.T. Harriott, assistant editor of *Drum* magazine, requested a comment from Brundage on the current state of South African sport, asking for "some suggestions about how the major non-white sporting bodies can gain international recognition.... I hope you can help us in this way because so many people in South Africa are vitally interested in the Olympic prospects of all racial people."²⁸⁰ Brundage's reply remained non-committal,²⁸¹ but Harriott persisted, offering his co-operation: "If there is any

information I can supply to you on the situation I will be glad to do so and, in fact, we are sending to you shortly, an article from the current issue of DRUM, which reflects on the above-mentioned situation.”²⁸² Harriott in turn hoped for access to news about the IOC’s deliberations, hinting that he “would be grateful if it could be arranged for the deliberations of the Olympics Committee in Moscow next month, to be reported to me in some way. An official note of the proceedings with regard to South African sport would be very welcome.”²⁸³ Harriott indeed subsequently forwarded to Brundage the *Drum*’s coverage of the issue.²⁸⁴

In general, the IOC remained non-committal and cautious in its public statements, especially those which might be published in a potentially not neutral magazine, such as the *Drum*, but South African non-white media produced a steady stream of newspaper articles explicitly describing racial discrimination in South African sport. Steel was mainly pleased with the general tendency of these news items, since they tended to confirm the opposition’s comments about the negative actions of South African sport authorities. But in view of the public frequently being misled by SANOC representatives, would people actually believe the news? Steel hoped “that the truth of all that we have said over the past years is accepted, and that your committee will see how time and time again they have been misled by the South African representatives who will say anything to avoid expulsion.”²⁸⁵

But Mayer notified Steel that the IOC itself had no shortage of evidence, and that the issue would be discussed at the Moscow Session.²⁸⁶ Copying Brundage on this correspondence, Mayer attached a personal note that indicated that the direction of SANOC’s fate was obvious:

After all the documents we have received I really think that our South African National Olympic Committee is working against our rules. At least the National Sports Federations of that country. They had their General Annual meeting on March 27th and promised to let us have a report which never reached us.... I think we should look over this problem very seriously in Moscow and take a decision, even if we have to suspend that Olympic Committee.²⁸⁷

Brundage also found a new ally by forging a liaison with an organization in the political realm. Endeavouring to situate the Liberal Party of South Africa on the “proper” side of history, Peter Brown, National Chairman, wrote Mayer to extend to the IOC its full support, passing a resolution at the 1962 National Congress of the Liberal Party of South Africa. The resolution stated: “That this congress of the Liberal Party urges the International Olympic Committee to debar South Africa from the next Olympic Games unless she is represented by a team selected from athletes of all races who measure up to Olympic standards.”²⁸⁸ Brown added that the Liberal Party was the only party open to members of all races, and that thus it was the party’s position “that to select an Olympic team on any other basis than that of the ability of the contestant was an affront to human dignity.... I would be most grateful if the text of this resolution could be brought to the notice of your committee when it next meets.”²⁸⁹

Although Brundage wanted to avoid political connections, Peter Brown’s initiative can be seen a symbol of the momentum for change in South Africa. A contributor to this momentum was the Anti-Apartheid Movement (AAM). On 26 April 1963, AAM released a “Boycott Apartheid Campaign” information sheet.²⁹⁰ It provided a summary of the current state of apartheid in South Africa, including those sporting bodies who had taken action against apartheid. AAM fully supported SASA in calling

for a boycott of all sport tours unless they were based on non-racial lines. Racism in sport should not be tolerated: "It is not a question of bringing politics into sport but of keeping politics out of it," proclaimed AAM.²⁹¹ "Every effort must be made to ensure that the International Olympic Committee, FIFA, and other international sports bodies refuse to condone white supremacy in sport."²⁹²

International support was growing. Nations such as the Sudan, represented by the Secretary of the Sudanese National Olympic Committee, endorsed the movement against racism in sport, decrying the violation of Olympic principles: "You can be rest assured of our full support in Nairobi and will fight until we see the South African [National] Olympic Committee kicked out."²⁹³ Keeping the public informed was essential. On 1 June 1963, S. Abdul, Secretary of the AAM, released a statement for both the press and sporting bodies which highlighted Brutus' arrest for failing to comply with a "banning order" from the South African government.²⁹⁴ Brutus was arrested on May 29th when meeting with Swiss journalist, Mr. Balsiger, after being assured by Jan Botha, a member of SANOC and the government, that Balsiger was able to meet with whomever he wished in order to construct a complete story. This, according to Abdul, displayed the government's determination to suppress the truth. "The Anti-Apartheid Movement will continue to expose racial discrimination in South African sport," exclaimed Abdul, "and we hope that in accordance with the Olympic Charter all national and international sports bodies will refuse to condone or accept racial discrimination in sport. Racialism should have no place in the international sporting community."²⁹⁵

With disbelief at the shooting of Brutus, who was trying to escape the authorities, Steel argued that the IOC had to shoulder at least some of the responsibility for the incident: "I honestly cannot see what further evidence you need of the ill-will of the South Africans and their fear of the case for non-racial sport being put against them.... I feel that if the case, put for year after year ... had not been turned down mainly on the insistence of a few powerful men despite all the evidence produced, this tragedy may well not have happened."²⁹⁶

The AAM also released a statement on the case, implicitly pointing a finger at SANOC for its collusion through inaction, in the government's race policies: "Mr. Brutus remains in prison in South Africa with the prospect of a serious charge facing him soon: it is the duty of all who detest this alliance with apartheid to protest to the British, Portuguese and Federal authorities, and to demand his release. Those who appease Verwoerd and aid him in persecuting men who believe in fundamental rights and dignity should not be permitted to get away with their duplicity."²⁹⁷

On a more reserved note, Americans' expression of concern also reached Brundage's desk. Is it noteworthy that these letters were written not by representatives of political or sports organization, but by ordinary private citizens. For example, Nancy Tucker of South Hadley, Massachusetts argued:

Like many Americans, I am concerned about the racial crises of today, both at home and abroad. Whether in the USA or in South Africa, I oppose racial segregation of any sort.... the South African [National] Olympic Committee have not agreed to open their membership to South African sportsmen of all races, even though they were asked to do so by the International Olympic Committee in June, 1962. This to me seems like a most unsportsmanlike and prejudiced attitude. I therefore strongly urge you to refuse ... the right of representing South Africa at the Olympic Games in Tokyo.²⁹⁸

Catherine Morris of Chicago was more specific in apportioning a large share of the blame to SANOC rather than the Government of South Africa: "At the present time, all sport in South Africa is segregated. This is so, not (primarily) because of the South African government's policy of apartheid, but as a result of the policy and practises of the South African National Olympic Committee. This body, which governs all South African sport, refuse to recognise racially integrated teams and support all-white teams."²⁹⁹ SANOC had, she continued, consistently supplied non-white athletes with inferior training opportunities and facilities, and disproportionately favoured white athletes. Only "a South Africa on an integrated, non-racial basis will be included in all sport; thus the Olympic principles will be upheld, and the growth of amateur sport throughout the world will be furthered."³⁰⁰

Stephen Groves of Chicago added a moral element to his complaints about SANOC:

I hope you have received a huge number of pleas to deny South Africa's segregated Olympic group international recognition. This and similar acknowledgement of her is condoning or approval of her inhumane policies. This country's open, blatant, official, even self-righteous entrenchment of her uncivilized indignities to dark-skinned alleged citizens is preposterous. Every dodging or rationalizing or begging the issue further perpetuates, even vindicates, their practices and 'philosophy' Anyone in any position to alleviate tyranny has an obligation to conscience, country, the U.N. and international humanity's conscience to identify these tyrannies for what they are and act against them with clarity and conviction: How else do we make our lives worthwhile and improve this human race?³⁰¹

The amount of mail Brundage, Mayer, and the IOC received relative to the South African issue grew to be overwhelming. At times, it was difficult to truly understand the legitimacy and intentions of a writer. This was certainly the case with one Ahmed Ebrahim who in a later letter identified himself as one of "the discriminated

sportsmen of South Africa.”³⁰² He submitted an appeal to Brundage on behalf of non-white athletes, believing that the IOC’s “decision should not be influenced by the fact that very many countries are hostile towards South Africa and are using this organization to further their political aims. The International Olympic Committee must simply consider whether the Olympic Committee of South Africa is fully complying with the fundamental principles of the Olympic Charter or not.”³⁰³

Had not the IOC been doing just that? Ebrahim developed his argument further by elaborating that for 50 years those who represented South Africa had been white. Invitations to trials were reserved for whites only although no laws prevented SANOC from organizing mixed sport, yet it did not facilitate mixed sport. Non-whites were only encouraged to affiliate in order to keep the white organizations relevant. This gave the illusion of non-white acceptance: “The South African [National] Olympic Committee is not prepared to hold mixed trials ... it is not prepared to allow white and non-white athletes to compete together against visiting teams ... it is not prepared to provide equal facilities ... it is not prepared to permit non-whites to hold offices in the S.A. Olympic Committee executive ... Yet it is guilty of all these and I cannot see how such a committee can be tolerated by the IOC when it openly and willfully defies the basic, fundamental principles of the Olympic Charter.”³⁰⁴

In Ebrahim’s opinion, the IOC had no alternative but to expel SANOC: “If the IOC condones the Olympic Committee of South Africa at this session then posterity will hold the IOC guilty of discriminating against 17,000 men non-white sportsmen of South Africa who for the past 55 years have been begging for recognition.”³⁰⁵ Some three months later, Ebrahim dispatched another lengthy letter to Brundage,

reiterating the same arguments he had advanced previously.³⁰⁶ He outlined all the facts to date, leading to the same conclusion as stated in the previous letter: "Sir, in compliance with the Olympic Spirit, we the discriminated sportsmen of South Africa demand the immediate suspension of South Africa and the elimination of race prejudice in the IOC and by the IOC."³⁰⁷

Ebrahim's information and arguments appeared to be solid. Why would the IOC not consider such a well-expressed statement? It was not until a telegram from Harris to Mayer that doubts were cast on Ebrahim's remarks: "We believe Ebrahim to be an agent of the South African government deliberately attempting to sabotage SAN-ROC's campaign against racialism in sport. He was expelled from SAN-ROC for this reason. The entire SAN-ROC committee from Brutus downwards repudiates him totally. Please disregard his attempts to cloud the vital issue."³⁰⁸

Although Ebrahim's proclamations were composed eloquently, his intentions could have been less than honest. However, his example was unique. Messages continued to arrive at the IOC. The South African Students' Union in Germany, for example, "with the support of all African states including the overwhelming majority of the people of South Africa appeal to you to exclude the South African Republic from the Olympic Games until its apartheid practises in sport cease. The coloured South African delegate at your conference is nominated by the all-white government and does not represent the interest of the non-European population of South Africa."³⁰⁹

Two weeks after SANOC issued its report to the IOC, the American Committee on Africa (ACA) rejuvenated its support for domestic resistance forces. Famed black baseball player Jackie Robinson of the ACA, made a request to the IOC to withdraw

SANOC's credentials. "The South African [National] Olympic Committee operates on racist principles," Robinson argued. "It has never selected a non-white athlete for Olympic competition. Its non-white affiliates are rigidly segregated. These facts constitute a clear denial of the spirit of the Olympic Games ... Sports competition is a uniquely non-racial activity. Only performance counts."³¹⁰ Rather, Robinson argued, an organization such as SAN-ROC should select the team for the 1964 Tokyo Games; handing control to SAN-ROC would encourage sport among non-whites, demonstrate disapproval of Brutus' behaviour, and remove sport from government control.³¹¹ Should the IOC avoid a clear decision on this issue, Robinson put the IOC on notice that he was

...prepared to undertake the following action: I, together with others of similar opinion, will urge that individual participants in the Games carefully consider how they feel about such discrimination, particularly when competing against a white South African. If they find themselves of the same opinion as myself, let them seriously consider whether they can in good conscience compete unless the South African scratches himself. I am aware that a boycott of this sort would create serious disruptions of the Games, but I see no other way of asserting a basic principle of all sportsmen: that a winner is the man whose performance is best, not whose skin is lightest.³¹²

Robinson's intervention suggested a novel strategy: rather than intervene at the organizational level, he was prepared to use his notoriety and convince individual athletes to reflect on the morality of their actions. The advantage of this strategy would be that it could cause serious disruptions at the Olympic Games without opening itself up to the charge that its proponents were playing the much criticized game of institutional politics.

On the other hand, Professor Peter Kaiser of Princeton University was more outright in proposing an immediate change in the organizations representing South Africa in the IOC and Olympic Movement:

It has come to my attention that the Olympic credentials of the South African [National Olympic Committee] may be discredited by the International Olympic Committee, in view of the racial policies followed by that organization. You therefore have my wholehearted support should you decide to accept the credentials of some such integrated Olympic sport organizations as the South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee and the South African Sports Association.³¹³

An emphatic missive from one of their own, the President of the Ghana Olympic Committee, may have carried greater weight with Brundage and the IOC, in particular as the President refused to exonerate SANOC by pointing to South African race politics, up until then a position frequently invoked by SANOC and the IOC alike; it was very doubtful whether SANOC had been acting ‘without fear or favour’:

[A] [f]undamental principle of the Olympic bible insists on no discrimination against any country or person on grounds of race, religion, or political affiliation. Apartheid South African [National] Olympic Committee is indefensibly guilty of a rude and insolent violation of this essential principle. That the conduct of South Africa’s Olympic Committee is influenced by political pressure from its government is a mere balderdash for Article 25 of the Olympic bible clearly demanding that National Olympic Committees must be completely independent and autonomous and in a position to resist all political religious or commercial pressure. Since the South African [National] Olympic Committee appears to be incapable of conforming to the rules and regulations, the provisions of paragraph 2 Article 25 – National Olympic [Committees] that do not conform to the rules and regulations of the International Olympic Committee forfeit their recognition and their right to send participants to the Olympic Games – should apply without fear or favour in order to instill confidence in the IOC. The present generation of African sportsmen is no longer docile and passive over issues affecting their interest and defeating the lofty ideals of the Olympic Movement. The rest of Africa should not be sacrificed by the IOC on the altar of apartheid hoping that the Baden-Baden spirit will direct the IOC to

take a bold and uncompromising decision as demanded by paragraph of Article 25 of the Olympic family.³¹⁴

The IOC needed to thoroughly assess the information it received, and new perspectives were welcomed. Count Dönhoff, European Director of the South African Foundation,³¹⁵ was eager to emphasize four points in light of SANOC's proposed exclusion.³¹⁶ First, it was hard to convince South African athletes that the exclusion was a just and equitable measure, especially considering what was happening in other African countries. Second, why would the IOC wish to interrupt the development of South African sport? A guarantee that any athlete with Olympic standards could compete was a remarkable development and significant when considering the country's context. Third, Soviet or Afro-Asian National Olympic Committees voting in favour of expulsion seemed unconscionable considering their own practices at home. For example, Dönhoff cited countries such as Zanzibar, Rwanda, India, Pakistan, Cyprus, Kenya, Tanganyika, and the Congo, each of which dealt with racial tolerance through mass genocide.³¹⁷ Finally, realising the political roots and implications of the problem in South Africa, Dönhoff noted: "... the sporting public in the Continental European countries will have but little comprehension for an Olympic analogy to the United Nations' treatment of South Africa, e.g. for a defamation of a proud little group of first class athletes by countries, the intolerance of which against their racial minorities is causing more and more concern to the civilized world."³¹⁸

The premises and explanation in Dönhoff's letter were strong arguments for reconsidering South Africa's admittance to the 1964 Tokyo Games. Brundage responded by pointing out that "we have not closed the door and that it is still possible for it [South Africa] to qualify for participation in the next Olympic Games in Tokyo

As you undoubtedly know, in the international climate which exists in this matter, it is very difficult for us to confine the argument to sport and avoid all political implications."³¹⁹ This may have been the first instance in which Brundage explicitly conceded that dealing with the South African issue would of course have 'political implications.' In the face of the stark realities of life in South Africa, the convenient separation of sport from politics, a strategy often employed by the IOC, could no longer be sustained.

The final discussion item received by the IOC on the banning of South Africa came from England-based SASA representative John Rogers. Rogers sought clarification on the policies of SASA and SAN-ROC, and unsurprisingly appealed to Mayer to use his influence to expel SANOC at the upcoming Congress of the IOC in Tokyo:

How can this body remain in 'good standing' within the IOC or with other Olympic members or International Federations? ... The provisional team of eighty-two athletes which the SANOC issued for the Tokyo Games included 7 non-whites. Frank Braun, the SANOC President, said that the whites and non-whites would be strictly segregated if they competed in Tokyo! ... This has been the only 'concession' to non-white South African sportsmen since the IOC warning to the SANOC over two years ago.... Non-racial sport is perfectly legal in South Africa. The SANOC could not publicly declare their belief in integration of sport and its administration as directed by the IOC because they believe in segregation.³²⁰

Rogers used the conclusion of his letter to sever his long association with the IOC. Neither Mayer nor Brundage responded to Rogers' letter before the Tokyo Games; the plea to expel SANOC at the scheduled IOC Session in Japan fell on deaf ears. However, the rising tide of South African and world censure led Brundage and the IOC to ultimately withdraw the invitation to SANOC to participate in the Tokyo Games.

5. Discussion: The Developments from 1960-1964

The ‘three dominant voices’—South African Olympic affiliates, domestic resistance, and international community—continued to resonate from 1960 to 1964. On the eve of the 1964 Tokyo Games, they provided sufficient evidence to allow a detailed insight into Avery Brundage’s, and the IOC’s, ultimate stance in regard to the South African situation. Each voice sustained a definitive narrative.

These three genre voices were salient factors contributing to the IOC’s final decision regarding South Africa’s participation in the 1960 Rome Games, and were also effective in the IOC’s decision to withdraw South Africa’s invitation to the 1964 Tokyo Games. First, Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter* was still at the core of the IOC’s debates regarding SANOC’s suspension, and Article 1 in conjunction with Article 24 ultimately caused the downfall of SANOC. Article 24 stated: “[National Olympic Committees] shall enforce all the Rules and Regulations of the International Olympic Committee.”³²¹ SANOC appeared to be trying to overcome the discrimination and racism in South African sport, but its actions were circumscribed by, among other things, South African government policies. Therefore, it could not truly enforce IOC rules and regulations.

Second, the protocol and structure of the IOC was a deciding force as the 1964 Tokyo Games approached. NOCs must embrace the Olympic Movement’s ideals and the IOC’s rules and regulations when making decisions regarding participation in the Olympic Games. Further, a number of resolutions involving SANOC were submitted to IOC members for voting decisions. Despite SANOC’s belief in properly enforcing IOC rules and regulations, and abiding by the imposed resolutions, there was a difference

between the IOC's and SANOC's interpretation of the IOC rules, regulations, and resolutions. However, the most important element of the IOC structure that led to the suspension of SANOC was the IOC bureaucracy itself. The power of the IOC to enforce change was, and remains, within the hands of its members. SANOC could not abide by the resolutions imposed by the IOC membership at the 1962 Moscow and 1963 Baden-Baden General Sessions. Although leniency was afforded to SANOC by interpreting the conditions of the Baden-Baden resolution in SANOC's favour—the request for proper trials to select the South African Olympic team and carrying out its duties under Article 24—there was one other condition that had to be unequivocally fulfilled. SANOC had to publicly dissociate itself from the South African government's policy of non-competition and non-integration in sport between whites and non-whites. According to the discussion from the 1964 Innsbruck IOC General Session, SANOC did not fulfill this obligation, which resulted in the withdrawal of the invitation to the 1964 Tokyo Games. SANOC did have more time to abide by the Baden-Baden resolution, since the final date to submit entries was not until mid-August, but it never publicly dissociated itself from the government's racist policy.

Third, it remained nonnegotiable for the IOC not to involve itself in political and domestic issues of any country. However, at this stage of the South African situation, the IOC's policy to keep the Olympic Movement non-political was being heavily challenged. Brundage acknowledged that political implications affected the IOC's decision-making process to suspend SANOC, but every effort was still made to base the decision on the IOC rules and regulations, and protocol and structure, even if

political and domestic issues influenced SANOC's actions that led to its withdrawal from the Olympic Games.

It is reasonable to conclude, then, that points one and two elaborated above dominated how the IOC administration handled the South African situation during the period leading up to the 1964 Tokyo Games. Politics were an element of the process, but they were not, yet, an overwhelming factor. Although the IOC only became tangentially involved with domestic matters due to the nature of the resolutions that were voted on by its members in the General Sessions, if a NOC was suspended or expelled partly based on the political element of Article 24, which, in this case, had to do with South Africa's government, then that was clearly a reflection of a domestic issue.

However, based on the correspondence from 1960 to 1964, Brundage's and the IOC's decisions were dominated by: (a) IOC rules and regulations, and (b) IOC protocol and structure. Focussing on these two points helps to understand why South Africa's invitation was withdrawn for the 1964 Tokyo Games. Despite SANOC's belief that it had abided by IOC rules, and that racial discrimination in South African sport was diminishing, it became obvious that the South African sporting situation stood awkwardly in confrontation with Articles 1 and 24 of the *Olympic Charter*. Further, SANOC did not fully meet the IOC's standards, nor did it fulfill its promises made at the 1960 Rome IOC General Session, nor meet any subsequent obligations imposed by each new resolution approved by the IOC's members. The reality was that SANOC's effort to integrate non-white athletes and organizations to the IOC's satisfaction was a failure. SANOC's actions, combined with the South African government's policies,

underscored the decision to withdraw South Africa's invitation to the 1964 Tokyo Games.

In light of SANOC's suspension, what influence, if any, did domestic resistance and the international community have on the IOC? Domestic resistance and international community perspectives shared the same sentiment expressed before the 1960 Rome Games: SANOC was a disgrace. If its messages and stances did not change, did its opinions matter? It was concluded earlier that its opinions failed to affect the decisions that were made in regard to SANOC's participation in the Olympic Movement leading up to the 1960 Rome Games. Even though the tone of messages scarcely changed leading up to the 1964 Tokyo Games, domestic resistance and international community perspectives played a greater role in SANOC's fate. Ultimately, SANOC itself provided sufficient evidence to justify its withdrawal from the Tokyo Games. Yet, because of the growth in both size and strength of censor against apartheid in South Africa, it was impossible to completely ignore domestic and international resistance perspectives.

Although the IOC's decisions leading up to the 1964 Tokyo Games resulted in South Africa's invitation to be withdrawn, was there any evidence of structural racism? The benefit of the doubt was given to SANOC when the IOC membership discussed if SANOC abided by the Baden-Baden resolution. SANOC's efforts in light of the South African government's laws and policies were noted, but SANOC had to dissociate itself from the government's stance on non-competition and non-integration of whites and non-whites in South African sport. SANOC's non-compliance of the resolution did prevent a more complicated problem for the IOC. If SANOC did dissociate itself from

the South African government, the IOC would have upheld the invitation to South Africa for the Tokyo Games, which would have meant that the IOC allowed SANOC to participate knowing fully that racial discrimination was occurring in South African sport. Once again, depending on the interpretation of the *Olympic Charter*, the IOC could have implicitly supported the racial discrimination in South African sport. Any arrangement to accommodate South Africa's participation in the IOC, Olympic Games, and Olympic Movement that did not include the complete abolition of racial discrimination could be interpreted as accepting racism in South African sport. SANOC did save the IOC from any further difficult decisions regarding South Africa's participation in the Tokyo Games. However, the details of the resolution served to create conditions of institutionalized racism.

Nonetheless, the organized efforts of those who opposed SANOC and the South African government were substantial, at least enough, to help clarify and provide the facts of the South African sporting situation to Brundage and the IOC, which led to the withdrawal of SANOC's invitation to the 1964 Tokyo Olympic Games. In the next chapter, treatment of the 1964-1968 period is the aim to discover if the messages from the 'three dominant voices' changed. Did those voices gain strength? Did they diminish? Or did they remain the same? Further, what was the reaction of the IOC and its leader, Avery Brundage?

Endnotes for Chapter Three

- ¹ Ira Emery to Otto Mayer, 20 September 1960, Avery Brundage Collection (hereafter cited as ABC), box 144, reel 81.
- ² Mayer to Emery, 23 September 1960, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³ Emery to Avery Brundage, 25 January 1961, box 144, reel 81.
- ⁴ Ibid.
- ⁵ Emery to Mayer, 9 February 1961, box 144, reel 81.
- ⁶ Emery to Brundage, 13 February 1961, box 144, reel 81.
- ⁷ Mayer to Emery, 13 February 1961, box 144, reel 81.
- ⁸ Mayer to Brutus, 14 February 1961, box 144, reel 81.
- ⁹ Brundage to Emery, 18 February 1961, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁰ Emery to Brundage, 28 March 1961, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹¹ Brutus to Emery, 25 March 1961, box 144, reel 81 found in *ibid.*
- ¹² Emery to Brutus, 28 March 1961, box 144, reel 81 found in Emery to Brundage, 28 March 1961, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹³ Emery to Brundage, 10 April 1961, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁴ Ibid.
- ¹⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁶ Emery to Brundage, 17 April 1961, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁷ "Gen. Klopper's Assurance to Non-White Sportsmen," *The Star, Johannesburg*, 15 April 1961, ABC, box 144, reel 81, found in *ibid.*
- ¹⁸ Brundage to Emery, 18 April 1961, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ¹⁹ Mayer to Brundage, undated, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁰ Emery to Brundage, 15 June 1961, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²¹ Ibid.
- ²² Mayer to South African National Olympic Committee (hereafter cited as SANOC), 25 September 1961, ABC, box 144, reel 81. Capitalized in original.
- ²³ Mayer to L.M. Francey, 28 September 1961, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁴ Ibid.
- ²⁵ Honey to Brundage, 13 February 1962, ABC, box 58, reel 34.
- ²⁶ Brundage to Honey, 22 February 1962, ABC, box 58, reel 34.
- ²⁷ Francey to Mayer, 19 March 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁹ Francey to Mayer, 30 April 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³⁰ Ibid. Underscored in original.
- ³¹ Mayer to Francey, 7 May 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³² H.B. Klopper to Mayer, 25 May 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

- 33 IOC, "60th IOC Session, Moscow, 1962," in *IOC General Session Minutes, Volume IV (1956-1988)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992).
- 34 Mayer to SANOC, 19 June 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 35 Emery to IOC, undated, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 36 Mayer to Francey, 19 August 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 37 Jan Botha to Mayer, 20 September 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 38 Botha to Mayer, 18 October 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 39 Mayer to Botha, 26 October 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 40 Francey to Mayer, 5 November 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81; see also Rangasamy to Francey, 22 August 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81 found in South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee (hereafter cited as SAN-ROC) package, 24 May 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 41 Ibid.
- 42 Francey to Brundage, 5 November 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 43 Ibid.
- 44 Mayer to Francey, 12 November 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 45 Ibid. Underscored in original.
- 46 Brundage to SANOC (Attn.: Francey), 19 November 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 47 Mayer to Francey, 20 November 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 48 Francey to Mayer, 5 February 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 49 Ibid.
- 50 SANOC Press Release, undated, ABC, box 144, reel 81 found in Francey to Mayer, 5 February 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 51 Ibid.
- 52 Francey to Brundage, 16 April 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 53 Mayer to Francey, 6 May 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 54 Brundage to Francey, 8 May 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 55 Francey to Mayer, 9 May 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 56 Mayer to Francey, 14 May 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 57 Ibid. Capitalized in original.
- 58 Ibid.
- 59 Mayer to Francey, 20 May 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 60 Francey to Mayer, 4 June 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81 found in Francey to Brundage, 4 June 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 61 Ibid.
- 62 Ibid. Underscored in original.
- 63 Mayer to Francey, 12 June 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 64 Brundage to SANOC, 5 August 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 65 Francey to Brundage, 12 September 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 66 Mayer to Francey, 14 September 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 67 Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Summary of Rudolph Balsiger's Report, 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ The only correspondence available from Brundage to Balsiger appears almost a year after Brundage received the summary of Balsiger's report. Since the time of Brundage's response was so much later, he might be responding to a different letter from Balsiger: "Thank you for your long and interesting letter on the South African problem, which troubles us greatly. There is much truth in what you say. I have also studied your pamphlet.... We are, of course, solely concerned with sport and in this case it is very difficult to keep sport questions and political question separate." (Brundage to Balsiger, 22 August 1964, ABC, box 144, reel 81).

⁷⁵ SANOC Report, 1 October 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Willi Daume to Select Group, 15 October 1963, ABC, box 147, reel 82.

⁸² Sir Arthur Porritt Resolution, undated, ABC, box 147, reel 82.

⁸³ R.S. Alexander Motion, October 1963, ABC, box 147, reel 82.

⁸⁴ G.D. Sondhi Proposition, undated, ABC, box 147, reel 82.

⁸⁵ Massard Proposition, undated, ABC, box 147, reel 82.

⁸⁶ Marquess of Exeter Resolution, undated, ABC, box 147, reel 82.

⁸⁷ IOC, "61st IOC Session, Baden-Baden, 1963," in *IOC General Session Minutes, Volume IV (1956-1988)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 80.

⁸⁸ Unaddressed, undated, ABC, box 147, reel 82.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Mayer to Francey, 18 December 1963, ABC, box 147, reel 82.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ IOC Letter, undated, ABC, box 58, reel 34.

⁹⁴ Frank Braun to Brundage and IOC Members, 8 January 1964, ABC, box 147, reel 82.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Ibid. Underscored and capitalized in original.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Braun to Marquess of Exeter, 8 January 1964, ABC, box 147, reel 82.

¹⁰⁰ Braun to Mayer, 8 January 1964, ABC, box 147, reel 82. Underscored in original.

- 101 Braun to Brundage, 8 January 1964, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 102 Ibid.
- 103 Ibid.
- 104 Brundage to Braun, 18 January 1964, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 105 IOC, "1964. Innsbruck," in *IOC Executive Committee Minutes, Volume II (1948-1969)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 169. Bolded in original.
- 106 IOC, "62nd IOC Session, Innsbruck, 1964," in *IOC General Session Minutes, Volume IV (1956-1988)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 88-9.
- 107 SANOC Statement, 16 June 1964, ABC, box 147, reel 82 found in Braun to Mayer, 20 June 1964, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 108 Ibid.
- 109 Braun to Mayer, 20 June 1964, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 110 Ibid.
- 111 Braun to Brundage, 20 June 1964, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 112 Ibid.
- 113 Ibid.
- 114 IOC, "1964. Lausanne," in *IOC Executive Committee Minutes, Volume II (1948-1969)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 171.
- 115 Braun to Mayer, 8 August 1964, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 116 Mayer to Braun, 13 August 1964, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 117 Emery to Brundage, 4 July 1961, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 118 Ibid.
- 119 Emery to Brundage, 11 August 1961, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 120 Ibid.
- 121 Ibid.
- 122 Emery to Brundage, 14 August 1961, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 123 Brundage to Emery, 28 August 1961, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 124 Emery to Brundage, 1 September 1961, ABC, box 145, reel 81. The Group Areas Act discussed by Emery was first implemented in 1950. The Act divided the entire country into geographical areas based on race. See Nancy L. Clark and William H. Worger, *South Africa: The Rise and Fall of Apartheid* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2004) for more detail.
- 125 Emery to Brundage, 27 September 1961, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 126 Emery to Brundage, 28 September 1961, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 127 Emery to Brundage, 9 October 1961, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 128 Emery to Brundage, 4 December 1961, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 129 Brundage to Emery, 15 December 1961, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 130 Emery to Brundage, 30 January 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 131 Emery to Brundage, 31 January 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 132 Emery to Brundage, 2 February 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.

- 133 Emery to Brundage, 5 February 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 134 Emery to Brundage, 5 February 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 135 Emery to Brundage, 12 February 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 136 Emery to Brundage, 14 February 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 137 Ibid.
- 138 Emery to Brundage, 19 February 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 139 Ibid.
- 140 Emery to Brundage, 29 March 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 141 Emery to Brundage, 2 April 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 142 Brundage to Emery, 7 April 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 143 Brundage to Emery, 16 April 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 144 Emery to Brundage, 24 April 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81. Underscored in original.
- 145 Ibid.
- 146 Emery to Marquess of Exeter, 1 May 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 147 Ibid.
- 148 Ibid.
- 149 Emery to Brundage, 8 May 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 150 Emery to Mayer, 10 May 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 151 Emery to Marquess of Exeter, 14 May 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81 found in Emery to Mayer, 14 May 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 152 H.B. Kloppe to Mayer, 25 May 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 153 Emery to Brundage, 24 May 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 154 Ibid.
- 155 Emery to Mayer, 8 June 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81. (Note: only the first page of this letter was available in the ABC).
- 156 Ibid.
- 157 Ibid.
- 158 Brundage to Emery, 14 July 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81. Underscoring is mine.
- 159 Emery to Brundage, 24 July 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 160 Ibid.
- 161 Ibid.
- 162 Brundage to Emery, 3 August 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 163 Ibid.
- 164 Emery to Mayer, 21 August, 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 165 Ibid.
- 166 See, for example, Mayer to Emery, 12 November 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 167 Brundage to Emery, 19 November 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81. Capitalized in original.
- 168 Emery to Brundage, 27 November 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 169 Brundage to Emery, 12 December 1962, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 170 Emery to Brundage, 10 January 1963, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 171 Ibid.

- 172 Emery to Brundage, 11 January 1963, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 173 Emery to Brundage, 14 January 1963, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 174 Brundage to Emery, 19 January 1963, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 175 Ibid.
- 176 Emery to Brundage, 21 January 1963, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 177 Ibid.
- 178 Brundage to Emery, 25 February 1963, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 179 Emery to Brundage, 1 March 1963, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 180 Ibid.
- 181 Brundage to Emery, 18 March 1963, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 182 Emery to Brundage, 11 June 1963, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 183 Brundage to Emery, 20 September 1963, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 184 Emery to Brundage, 7 October 1963, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 185 Brundage to Emery, 26 October 1963, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 186 Brundage to Emery, 12 November 1963, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 187 Ibid.
- 188 Ibid.
- 189 Emery to Brundage, 22 November 1963, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 190 Brundage to Emery, 2 December 1963, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 191 Brundage to Emery, 9 January 1964, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 192 Emery to Brundage, 25 March 1964, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 193 Brundage to Emery, 31 March 1964, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 194 Emery to Brundage, 15 June 1964, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 195 Emery to Brundage, 18 June 1964, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 196 Ibid.
- 197 Article Translation, Dabbreek en Sondagnuus, 28 June 1964, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 198 Brundage to Emery, 10 July 1964, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 199 Emery to Brundage, 21 July 1964, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 200 Brundage to Emery, 29 July 1964, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 201 Brundage to Emery, 20 August 1964, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 202 Dennis Brutus to Mayer, 6 February 1961, box 144, reel 81.
- 203 Brutus to Emery, 25 March 1961, box 144, reel 81 found in *ibid*.
- 204 Emery to Brutus, 28 March 1961, box 144, reel 81 found in Emery to Brundage, 28 March 1961, box 144, reel 81.
- 205 Brutus to Emery, 3 April 1961, box 144, reel 81.
- 206 Mayer to Brutus, 26 April 1961, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 207 Ibid.
- 208 Brutus to Mayer, 26 April 1961, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 209 Ibid.
- 210 Brutus to Brundage, 12 November 1961, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- 211 Ibid.

- ²¹² Brutus to National Olympic Committees (hereafter cited as NOC), 1 January 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²¹³ Brutus (South African Sports Association [hereafter cited as SASA] general release), 7 February 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²¹⁴ John Rogers to Brundage, 3 January 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²¹⁵ Brutus to Brundage, 12 February 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²¹⁶ Ibid.
- ²¹⁷ Brutus to Mayer, 6 March 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²¹⁸ International Olympic Committee (hereafter cited as IOC), "1962. Lausanne," in *IOC Executive Committee Minutes, Volume II (1948-1969)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 157.
- ²¹⁹ Mayer to SANOC, 10 March 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²²⁰ Ibid.
- ²²¹ Mayer to Brutus, 23 March 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²²² Brutus (Supplementary Report on Racial Discrimination in South African Sport from the SASA), 24 May 1962, box 144, reel 81 found in *ibid.*
- ²²³ Ibid.
- ²²⁴ G.K. Rangasamy to Owen Wynne, 1 July 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²²⁵ SASA document, 9 July 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²²⁶ Rangasamy to Reginald Honey, 16 July 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²²⁷ Rangasamy to South African National Sports Federation, 7 August 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²²⁸ Francey to Rangasamy, 15 August 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²²⁹ Rangasamy to Francey, 22 August 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81 found in South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee (hereafter cited as SAN-ROC) package, 24 May 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²³⁰ Brutus to Brundage, 9 October 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²³¹ Brutus to Honey, 9 October 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²³² Ibid.
- ²³³ SASA to Francey, 25 November 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²³⁴ Reg Hlongwane to Mayer, undated, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²³⁵ Ibid.
- ²³⁶ Hlongwane, *Address to 2nd Biennial General Meeting of SASA*, 13 January 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81 found in SAN-ROC package, 24 May 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²³⁷ Hlongwane to Brundage, 6 February 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²³⁸ Rangasamy to Francey, 9 February 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²³⁹ N. Rathinasamy to Brundage, 9 March 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁴⁰ Brundage to Rathinasamy, 25 March 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁴¹ Unaddressed, undated, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²⁴² Rathinasamy to Mayer, 18 April 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁴³ Rathinasamy to Secretary of the Japanese Olympic Committee, 18 April 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81 found in *ibid.*

- ²⁴⁴ Mayer to Brundage, undated, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁴⁵ Rathinasany to all Olympic Committees and Sportsmen, 5 May 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81 found in SAN-ROC package, 24 May 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁴⁶ Ibid.
- ²⁴⁷ Mayer to Rathinasany, 23 May 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁴⁸ SAN-ROC package, 24 May 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁴⁹ Ibid.
- ²⁵⁰ Mayer to Secretary of SAN-ROC, 12 June 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81. Underscored in original.
- ²⁵¹ John Harris to Mayer, 22 July 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁵² Mayer to Harris, 29 July 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁵³ Brutus statement, 26 August 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁵⁴ Ibid. Capitalized in original.
- ²⁵⁵ Harris Statement, 26 August 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81 found in Abdul to IOC, 1 October 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81. Underscored in original.
- ²⁵⁶ SAN-ROC Statement, undated, ABC, box 144, reel 81 found in Abdul to IOC, 1 October 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁵⁷ Harris, *The Case for the Suspension of the South African Olympic Committee*, undated, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁵⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁵⁹ Ibid.
- ²⁶⁰ Ibid
- ²⁶¹ Ibid.
- ²⁶² Harris to Mayer, 1 October 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁶³ Ibid.
- ²⁶⁴ Abdul Minty to Brundage, undated, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁶⁵ SAN-ROC Statement, 14 October 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁶⁶ Ibid.
- ²⁶⁷ Ibid.
- ²⁶⁸ Harris to IOC Executive Board, 13 December 1963, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²⁶⁹ Ibid. Capitalized in original.
- ²⁷⁰ Ann Hams to IOC Executive Board, 25 May 1964, ABC, box 147, reel 82. Although this was a two-page letter, the second page is completely faded, therefore, illegible. Underscored in original.
- ²⁷¹ Ibid.
- ²⁷² Antony Steel to Mayer, 14 August 1961, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁷³ Mayer to Steel, 16 August 1961, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁷⁴ Ibid. A response from Brundage to Mayer's private comments was unavailable at hand.
- ²⁷⁵ Steel to Mayer, 5 September 1961, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁷⁶ Ibid.
- ²⁷⁷ Ibid.
- ²⁷⁸ John Rogers to Brundage, 3 January 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

- ²⁷⁹ André Ungar to Brundage, 5 April 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁸⁰ E.T. Harriott to Brundage, 24 April 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁸¹ Brundage to Harriott, 4 May 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁸² Harriott to Brundage, 15 May 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁸³ Ibid.
- ²⁸⁴ Harriot to Brundage, 23 May 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81
- ²⁸⁵ Steel to Mayer, 1 May 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁸⁶ Mayer to Steel, 2 May 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁸⁷ Ibid.
- ²⁸⁸ Peter Brown to Mayer, 3 December 1962, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁸⁹ Ibid.
- ²⁹⁰ The Anti-Apartheid Movement (cited hereafter as AAM), *Boycott Apartheid Campaign*, 26 April 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81 found S. Abdul to IOC, 1 October 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁹¹ Ibid.
- ²⁹² Ibid.
- ²⁹³ Kaim Osman Hussein Osman (Secretary of the Sudanese National Olympic Committee) to AAM Secretary, 30 April 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁹⁴ Abdul Statement, 1 June 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81 found in Abdul to IOC, 1 October 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁹⁵ Ibid.
- ²⁹⁶ Steel to IOC Chancellor, 23 September 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁹⁷ AAM, Dennis Brutus, undated, ABC, box 144, reel 81 found in Abdul to IOC, 1 October 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁹⁸ Nancy Tucker to Brundage, 5 October 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁹⁹ Catherine Morris to Brundage, 5 October 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³⁰⁰ Ibid.
- ³⁰¹ Stephen Groves to Brundage, 11 October, 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³⁰² See, Ebrahim to Brundage, 28 January 1964, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³⁰³ Ahmed Ebrahim to Brundage, 13 October 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³⁰⁴ Ibid.
- ³⁰⁵ Ibid.
- ³⁰⁶ Ebrahim to Brundage, 28 January 1964, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³⁰⁷ Ibid.
- ³⁰⁸ Harris to Mayer, undated, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³⁰⁹ Bennett Marengwa and Victor Kadalie to Brundage, 14 October 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³¹⁰ Jackie Robinson to IOC, 16 October 1963, box 144, reel 81.
- ³¹¹ Ibid.
- ³¹² Ibid.
- ³¹³ Peter Kaiser to Brundage, 21 October 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³¹⁴ Ghana Olympic Committee President to IOC, 16 January 1964, ABC, box 147, reel 82.

³¹⁵ According to Count Dönhoff, the South African Foundation was “a non-political national organisation, which has been created three years ago by 200 leading South African personalities from all walks of life and from all political denominations including the opposition parties.... working for the Foundation’s aim to promote better international understanding of the South African facts and problems.” (Count Dönhoff to Brundage, 27 January 1964, ABC, box 144, reel 81).

³¹⁶ Dönhoff to Brundage, 27 January 1964, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

³¹⁷ Ibid.

³¹⁸ Ibid.

³¹⁹ Brundage to Dönhoff, 2 February 1964, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

³²⁰ Rogers to Mayer, 16 September 1964, ABC, box 147, reel 82. Underscored in original.

³²¹ IOC, *The Olympic Games: Fundamental Principles, Rules and Regulations, General Information* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 1962), 16.

Chapter Four: Succumbing to International Political Pressure: Avery Brundage and the IOC, 1964-1968

1. Introduction

The overall tensions and dynamic of the South African discussion increased immensely between the 1964 Tokyo Games and the 1968 Mexico City Games. Although the dialogue between the IOC, South African Olympic affiliates, domestic resistance forces, and voices of the international community continued, two new elements – the IOC South Africa Commission (SAC) and the opinions of individual IOC and National Olympic Committee (NOC) members – added content to an already complicated situation. The main messages on the status of non-whites in South African sport continued to resonate in global perspective. South African Olympic affiliates, represented primarily by the South African National Olympic Committee (SANOC), were fighting a “life or death” battle to remain in the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement. Efforts to integrate non-white athletes and organizations into the white-dominated sport system continued. Some concessions were achieved from the South African government to accommodate the IOC’s requests, but ultimately, the continued effort failed to garner the needed approbation from those who opposed apartheid. The domestic resistance entities present from 1955-1964, waned between 1964 and 1968. However, domestic resistance forces acquired new sources of support that maintained a contradictory stance with SANOC’s ongoing progress. Those supporting the domestic resistance network, once again, vied to have SANOC

suspended until the South African situation was corrected. The majority of the international community persisted to advocate in support of the domestic resistance. Until SANOC abided by IOC rules and regulations, the international community petitioned for SANOC's suspension or its expulsion altogether.

As these genre voices became more complex, it became apparent how they shaped the responses and decisions affecting SANOC's status and South Africa's participation in the IOC, the Olympic Games, and the Olympic Movement in general. The years of correspondence, information, and action leading up to the 1968 Mexico City Games yielded the same result as the years approaching the 1964 Tokyo Games. By 1968, the IOC was forced to succumb to international and political pressure to save the future of the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement. The result was a decision to once again withdraw the invitation from South Africa to participate in the 1968 Mexico City Games.

2. South African Olympic Affiliates

It was almost a full year after the 1964 Tokyo Games before Avery Brundage was contacted by a South African Olympic affiliate. Frank Braun, SANOC President, extended an invitation to Brundage to visit South Africa in early 1966.¹ Perhaps it was the suspension from the 1964 Tokyo Games that prompted silence between IOC officials and SANOC. However, South African Olympic affiliates remained eager to continue the process of gaining re-entry into the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement as soon as possible. The first attempt to reintegrate into the Olympic community occurred at a National Olympic Committee (NOC) Assembly in Rome.

Giulio Onesti, Italian NOC President, sent an invitation to SANOC. Reginald Honey, the South African IOC member, decided to participate, though Onesti was reluctant to have SANOC representatives attend. Due to the protest and threatened boycott from other participating countries in the Assembly, the Italian hosts tried to broker a compromise. He proposed to formally identify Honey solely as a member of the IOC, but not a representative of SANOC: "Mr. Honey did not want to assent to this proposal and made violent charges against the IOC and its President, regarding them responsible for interference in South Africa's home affairs. He affirmed that he was not going to bestow anything to anybody and that he would be present at the meeting as representative of the SANOC."²

In the face of Honey's uncompromising stance, Italian officials tried to convince him to withdraw from the meeting, but Honey insisted on attending. If he was to be denied attendance he insisted that the Italian National Olympic Committee (CONI) prepare and read a letter in front of the entire Assembly explaining why he could not participate. His request was denied, and it was stated to Honey that the reason for his withdrawal was due to South Africa's exclusion from the 1964 Tokyo Games. In a fit of rancour, Honey held a press conference before the Rome session commenced. This was seen by Onesti as a rebellious act. Onesti apologized to Brundage for such a farce, belatedly realizing that the Italian delegation should not have invited SANOC to the NOC Assembly in the first place. According to Onesti, Honey was treated with the utmost hospitality, but Onesti hoped for further clarifications from Brundage and the IOC on how best to handle such a matter, hoping that "the NOC[s] receive clear and precise indications in this respect."³ Honey, in turn, wrote to Brundage, offering his

own view of CONI's conduct: "To me, the attitude of the C.O.N.I. is incomprehensible and I think it is my duty to disclose the facts to you at once. I certainly think that they should be disclosed to those attending the meeting of the IOC in Madrid.... I want you and every one to appreciate that there was no personal rudeness to me. But I quite candidly feel that my N.O.C. has been treated very shabbily, if not insulted."⁴

The NOC incident garnered enough attention to generate discussions at both the Executive Board and General Sessions in Madrid. In the Executive Board meeting, it was pointed out that SANOC was only suspended, not expelled from the IOC. Nonetheless, the "IOC had hoped that Mr. Honey could convince his Government to abolish apartheid in sports, but nothing had been done.... DECISION: to propose that the NOC take a stand against this discrimination. If it does not comply, to suspend the NOC until such time as their Rules will be in conformity with those of IOC."⁵

Discussions at the General Session served to keep the pressure on South African Olympic officials. African delegates noted it as "peculiar that South Africa's athletes could not participate, but its officials continued to sit in on Olympic meetings." No option remained other than to tell Honey to leave, in particular since "Brundage reported that the African NOCs present in Madrid during the NOC meeting had been agitated, but after his promise that the IOC would make a decision, [the African NOCs] had promised to refrain from protests." The assembly reached the decision that if no progress were to be noted in South Africa by the 1966 Rome session, it would be suspended, "and its officials will no longer be able to participate in meetings."⁶

After the Madrid IOC meetings, Brundage raised with SANOC president Braun the invitation to visit South Africa that had been extended earlier. Perhaps it was time for

Brundage to see the situation for himself, and he was quite optimistic about the likelihood of such a visit.⁷ The official position of the IOC on the results of the Madrid meeting was communicated by IOC Secretary, Lydia Zanchi. Representatives of African NOCs had raised the question of the suspension of South Africa. The IOC would invite SANOC representatives to the Rome Executive Board meeting scheduled for late April, to appraise the IOC of SANOC's activities and any improvements evident in South African sports, "in accordance with the Olympic Regulations and about the declaration voted during the Baden-Baden and Innsbruck sessions in 1963 and 1964."⁸

SANOC's presentation to the Executive Board in Rome pointed to a significant change in the political strategies of South Africa on the issue. SANOC committed itself "to follow IOC rules and ... pick 50 percent of the [1968 Olympic team] with 50 percent non-whites, both athletes and officials. The Government has accepted this which is an enormous step forward because the Apartheid [sic] laws are so important that if you break them severe punishment is a risk. The IOC can publish this if it so wishes."⁹ The Executive Board in response decided to delay any decisions on the removal of South Africa, arguing that "it serve[d] nobody to throw South Africa out of the Olympic Movement. The only losers will be the athletes. It decides to wait to hear the results of the work of its mixed committee."¹⁰ SANOC succeeded in delaying any adverse decisions for yet another year; no decision would be taken until the 1967 Tehran meetings. In addition, Braun reported that the government agreed to form a committee to select a team, the first time that the government acceded to such a request. Brundage rationalized the decision by pointing out that apartheid law was an

official government matter; SANOC would risk sanctions if it violated those laws; overly precipitate action would be worse than a little more patience. "If we expel them now, we will never see them again. If we suspend them it might endanger the arrangement they are working on with the Government."¹¹

The conciliatory atmosphere at 1966 Rome meetings notwithstanding, some in the Olympic community remained doubtful of SANOC's assurance. For example, Reginald Alexander, Kenyan IOC member, affirmed that the Kenyan Olympic Committee supported the barring of SANOC until it abided by the *Olympic Charter*, but he advised the IOC to maintain contact with SANOC and exert all possible pressure to effect compliance.¹²

Nevertheless, hope for change in South African sport was high. Brundage wrote Honey to discuss the tragic assassination of South African Prime Minister, Hendrik Verwoerd, and its implications for South African sport's progress. Foremost on his mind was the IOC fact-finding Commission under consideration to study the conditions of sport in South Africa.¹³ Honey noted his approval of the Commission, recommending Ade Ademola (Nigeria), Reginald Alexander (Kenya) and Johann Westerhoff (Netherlands);¹⁴ Brundage appointed all three to join the South Africa Commission (SAC).¹⁵

Appointed to SAC, Westerhoff, who was then serving as IOC Secretary General, wrote to Braun requesting detailed organization information on the structure, organization and membership of South African Olympic sports; appointment procedure for NOC and NSF officials; the state of sport facilities; and explanations of government policies affecting sports. Westerhoff concluded with a political

admonition: "In connection herewith we should like to have with the Memorandum, from your side, recommendations to enable the South African [National] Olympic Committee to fulfill the Olympic Code."¹⁶ The IOC Executive Board likewise wished the Commission to focus on the racializing contexts of South African sports: "What the IOC has to find out is whether or not all athletes regardless of colour are able to compete in the Games or whether the NOC, regardless of colour, picks the best athletes, and by doing so, comply with the rules."¹⁷

Westerhoff acknowledged SANOC's information package but pointed out that by then the Commission had run out of time for an adequate tour of inspection, and would have to delay the trip until after the IOC meetings in Tehran.¹⁸ Braun complained to Brundage that SANOC had not been advised of the potential relevance of the Tehran meetings after Honey was dismissed from the 1965 NOC Assembly meetings in Rome: "Mr. Onesti did not consider it necessary to advise us of the Tehran Meetings.... Apart from the fact that as you already know the position of sport in our country has been considerably changed, I consider it essential that we should be allowed to attend his unofficial Meetings to hear what is going on behind the scenes in certain N.O.C. circles."¹⁹

During the Executive Board meeting in Tehran, an update was provided on SAC's status. If further delays were encountered concerning the appointed members of SAC, new members would have to be selected.²⁰ The discussions at the Tehran General Session indicated that a firmer direction was required. Westerhoff regretted the unanticipated delays, and made reference to the illegitimate use of the word mark, 'Olympic' by an organization called SAN-ROC, which would therefore not be on the list

of consulting organizations during the tour. Brundage himself emphasized again the IOC's common perspective at the time – it was not the Commission's remit to pass judgement on South African policies; it was to concern itself solely with issues directly related to sports: "... there is a difference between the government Policy of Apartheid and Racial Discrimination [sic] in sport. We, as IOC, are concerned with sport only and the Olympic Movement."²¹ SANOC President Frank Braun framed his report around a compatible message, arguing that the South African government had made several concessions in its policy; this appeared sufficient to decision-makers at the meeting. Despite forceful opposition by delegates from Nigeria, Mali, Congo Brazzaville and Uganda, supported by Russia, Romania, Cuba, and the United Arab Republic,²² it was thus decided to dispatch the Commission no later than the end of August 1967, to submit a report in time for consideration by IOC at the Grenoble 1968 meeting.²³

The wording of SANOC's detailed report served to obfuscate the underlying South African position; apartheid in sports would continue to be practiced at home, but – for white athletes at least – not abroad, since:

... it was not the intention to export the policy of separate development and that it was therefore perfectly in order for whites to compete against non-whites overseas. As each population group would make its own nominations, trials, as such, before the departure of the team were not necessary. In those instances where a doubt could exist and where only one competitor can be entered, but reserves are allowed, such as in boxing, the elimination or final selection could be arranged at the venue of the competition.²⁴

The implicit assumption that in that case, non-white athletes might also be allowed to attend trials outside of South Africa, was rejected as a misunderstanding and countered with the release of a clarifying press release.²⁵ This did nothing to assuage

the concerns of some delegates, and after SANOC delegates had made their case on May 6, “[a]lmost immediately ... the Russian and United Arab Republic IOC Members made a vehement attack on ‘the South Africa Race Policy’ and demanded that under the circumstances the South Africa National Olympic Committee should be expelled from the Olympic Family of Nations...”²⁶

The IOC arrived at a formal decision on the subsequent day. Noting the progress that had occurred in South Africa, concerning the issue of racial segregation in sports, the IOC resolved to dispatch the Commission no later than late August 1967, “for consideration by the International Olympic Committee at Grenoble in February, 1968.... this resolution prevents South Africa’s participation in the 1967 Pre-Olympic Meeting in Mexico and the Winter Games in Grenoble.”²⁷ A related resolution enjoined SAN-ROC to desist making use of the term ‘Olympic’ in its name, since this served to create the erroneous impression that SAN-ROC was a legitimate representative of South African Olympic sports.²⁸

Two months after the Tehran meetings, Westerhoff reviewed with Braun some necessary conditions for SAC’s visit. The Commission insisted on guarantees of unrestricted travel and access, “to contact anybody wanted and to stay together during that visit, and that the necessary entry permits be obtained.”²⁹ Of particular concern was the position of Commission member and IOC representative for Nigeria Sir Adetokunbo Ademola:

... any unforeseen happening, whatever it may be, could immediately cause great embarrassment, if not more, between your country and Nigeria, or between Africans black and white, all precautions should be taken to avoid such a situation. It is therefore necessary that we should receive special guarantees from you and your government as

to the personal safety of Sir Ade Ademola and that of the commission as a whole....³⁰

The concerns seem to have been unfounded, the Commission's travels proceeded without impediment, as is indicated by the letter of thanks sent to Braun by SAC Chairman Lord Killanin subsequent to the end of the trip.³¹ (The Commission's substantive work will be considered in a subsequent section of this chapter.)

The IOC Grenoble meetings, where the SAC report was to be presented, were projected to be poorly attended; it was deemed necessary to organize a postal vote to decide SANOC's fate.³² Killanin informed Honey of the postal vote,³³ and SANOC president Braun expressed the concern that it would be impossible for members not present at the meeting, to do the issue full justice, since "all IOC Members voting should have the benefit of the discussions that will be taking place at the meeting."³⁴ Since some members would not be able to attend, "in the interests of justice and in fairness to all concerned my Executive Board feels that after the discussions which will take place on 3rd February, 1968, a verbatim report, including all observations made by the South Africa delegation should be furnished to Members who will not be present in Grenoble, for consideration by them before exercising their vote."³⁵ Brundage, for his part, suggested to Braun the best strategy for SANOC to adopt in preparation for the Grenoble Session, exhibiting a certain degree of sympathy for SANOC's position:

If I were you I would have a statement ready for circulation, containing all the reasons for recognition. It should cite all the progress you have made, the fact that the vast majority if not all of the athletes, both white and black, want to participate, as against the handful of expatriates who would not be eligible in any event, etc. etc.... If South Africa cannot participate, it is the athletes, who have

nothing to do with the Government policy, that are penalized, not the Government. Point out that apartheid is a political issue like Communism and Nazism, and that we are concerned only with sport and not with politics. As I understand it, the Government has agreed to respect the policies of other countries and only asks that other countries respect its policies within its borders. A mixed team selected by a mixed committee, wearing the same uniform and traveling together will be produced. This you should point out, in the circumstances, will be a great victory for sport. The success of such a team will no doubt help you establish Olympic conditions within the country.... You have a copy I am sure, of the resolution offered by the African NOCs at Tehran. It would be well to answer this point by point. Emphasize the fact that sport should not be used as a tool or as a weapon for political purposes.³⁶

In his speech at the Grenoble meeting, Braun provided SANOC's response to the SAC report. He argued that the report highlighted the excitement of all South Africans for the 1968 Mexico City Games. The policy presented at Tehran, he stated, provided a sound base for co-operation between the races, underscored the illegitimacy of SAN-ROC, and emphasized SANOC's progress since 1963.³⁷ His interpretation of the SAC report concluded that "South Africa ha[d] every justification of claiming that it will in future be able to take part in the Olympic Games with a team comprising the best athletes on a guaranteed basis of equal opportunity and non-discrimination."³⁸ Exclusion of South Africa by the IOC would do nothing to change the political situation in the country, and only inflict harm on "the sportsmen, both Whites and more so the Non-Whites."³⁹ It had to be understood that sports could only be organized under the social and political conditions prevailing in a given country, to change which was beyond the IOC's authority. "By re-extending the hand of friendship in sports to the South African [National] Olympic Committee, the IOC can become the instrument which will lift sport out of politics. South Africa was asked to comply with certain

requirements,” Braun concluded. “This has been done and now we are ready to accept your invitation to compete in the 1968 Olympic Games.”⁴⁰

A lengthy discussion ensued, and the postal vote was completed by mid-February. The result by absolute majority was to re-admit a mixed South African team to the 1968 Games in Mexico City.⁴¹ In a telegram to Brundage, Braun described the non-white reaction in South Africa as “very favourable. Arrangement for a joint non-white selection committee is already in hand.... South Africa will not let you down.”⁴² A week later, towards the end of February 1968, Westerhoff restated to Braun the proposition made by SANOC at Tehran, a proposition that had to be effected in order to gain full recognition by the IOC. The conditions included a multi-racial team; the team must travel together; they must wear the same uniform and march under one flag; white and non-whites would be allowed to compete against each other at international meetings; and white and non-white officials involved in selecting the team. Westerhoff reiterated that the situation was still far from being resolved satisfactorily by attaching a copy of the complete Grenoble resolution, crafted by Australian IOC member Hugh Weir, focusing on the central demand that “a multi-racial team will be selected on merit.”⁴³ As long as the conditions laid down in the Tehran proposition were met, SANOC would be officially sanctioned to participate in the 1968 Mexico City Games.⁴⁴ At this juncture, Braun sent a highly complimentary and optimistic letter to Brundage, offering his,

... own humble tribute to your good self for the magnificent way in which you have handled the whole question. No one could possibly accuse you of taking sides in the matter and I have seldom in my experience, found a Chairman who has dealt so fairly with all parties concerned.... it has been South Africa’s paramount wish over the last

eight years to be able to participate with everybody belonging to the Olympic family and although we ourselves have suffered exclusion from the Tokyo Games, we feel that this would be the opportunity for all countries to celebrate the admission of a full multi-racial South African Team to the world's premier sporting event.⁴⁵

Neither the celebratory mood nor SANOC's optimism were to last. "The tremendous uproar, particularly in the press,"⁴⁶ caused by the Grenoble decision on South Africa's mixed team, indicated that the problem was as contentious as ever. Westerhoff was concerned that the vociferous public and media reaction might induce some members to propound problematic positions in order to assuage the public mood: "We have done our utmost here to give the press exact information and to ask them to stop writing about the issue and by so doing to help us avoid placing the different parties in such a situation that they cannot retract certain decisions."⁴⁷ Some IOC members were even considering calling an extraordinary IOC Executive Board meeting. Twenty-four requests for such a meeting had to be submitted, but the meeting then would require attendance by thirty-five members to achieve quorum; Westerhoff considered this unlikely – not a fortuitous display of IOC internal coherence.⁴⁸

In an effort to control the situation, Brundage advised Westerhoff to notify the Mexican Organizing Committee to forward an invitation to SANOC.⁴⁹ Further, Brundage advised Braun to "... see that caution is used in public statements from South Africa and keep me advised of developments, particularly the spontaneous response of the non-whites in your country."⁵⁰ Brundage also encouraged Honey to prepare a strong statement with evidence and referencing laws to prevent the withdrawal of the invitation to South Africa from the Mexico City Games.⁵¹

Brundage also was aware that no official withdrawals from the Mexico City Games had yet been received, and, although he had acknowledged a dozen requests for a special meeting, he was doubtful that any of NOCs had changed their stances, “and I doubt if many will after spending six years studying, debating and investigating the problem.”⁵² Nonetheless, he felt compelled to issue a formal, lengthy statement to all IOC and NOC members and to all ISFs asserting that the Grenoble decision did not amount to an endorsement of South African policies: it was focussed solely on sports-related issues, and the South African team would be multi-racial and selected by a multi-racial committee. The statement was noteworthy for the clarity with which it laid out the IOC’s fundamental principles, if under the circumstances somewhat theoretical insistence, of the separation of sports from politics: “For the first time the 16,000,000 non-whites of South Africa will have an opportunity to participate in the Olympic Games on a completely equal basis according to Olympic regulations. This invitation is for the 1968 Games only and the situation will be reviewed before the 1972 Games.”⁵³ Rumors of boycotts of the Games which had begun to circulate, he averred, would “astonish the 16,000,000 non-whites of South Africa who have no responsibility for South African political policies and who are rejoicing at their first opportunity to participate in world sport on the same basis as anyone else.”⁵⁴ The history of Olympic crises, Brundage argued, showed that in every case, the crisis was caused by the intrusion of politics into the area of sports. He cited as examples the 1936 Games, the uproar caused by the entry of teams from the Communist block into the 1952 Games, and the crisis of the Russian invasion of Hungary in 1956. Political responses in all of these cases inevitably occurred at the expense of sports, confirming

the necessity for the IOC's principally non-political stance. In the case of the 1956 Games, for example, "[c]ountry after country announced its withdrawal from the Games refusing to participate against the aggressors.... Hungarians and Russians were both there and the Games were a great success." Therefore, he argued:

It has been amply proven that, if there is one place an athlete, no matter what race, colour, religion or political affiliation, can display his talents and his abilities before the world, on a completely equal basis, it is the Olympic Games. Those who would abstain, forget the fundamental principle of no discrimination of the Olympic Movement and its objective to bring the young people of the world (who are not responsible for political policies) together in friendly competition. They would not only deprive their own athletes of this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity...⁵⁵

In short, he concluded, the IOC stood "firmly against discrimination of any kind in sport; this is the fundamental basis of the Olympic Movement. Equally important is the necessity of preventing the Olympic Movement from being used as a tool or weapon for other causes.... Olympic rules alas, apply only to the Olympic Games, they have no further competence. The IOC cannot very well reform the world..."⁵⁶

Brundage reinforced this message in a another lengthy, internal communication sent to Executive Board members in preparation for the special meeting of the Executive Board to discuss the South African situation. He reiterated the IOC's stance in principle not to accept the intrusion of politics, since it was:

... individuals and teams that must conform to Olympic regulations.... Olympic rules pertain only to the Olympic Movement, obviously they have no competence in other areas. Are we going to try to extend them to entire countries and to the whole world? ... These momentous questions which concern the integrity of the IOC must be given the most serious study before they are answered – the future of the Olympic Movement is at stake.⁵⁷

While Brundage was trying to firmly retain control against further damage within the IOC and in the public view, Killanin communicated with Braun on developments in South Africa. The IOC's decision to re-admit South Africa was under attack on multiple grounds, including ostensible misrepresentation in the SAC report of non-white reactions in South Africa, legal pressure from Mexico City, and the question of Olympic trials in South Africa.⁵⁸ Neither was SANOC to be assuaged which took "strong exception to this vexatious and unjustified effort to rescind the resolution which was recently passed, and which now entitles South Africa to participate in the Mexico Olympic Games. ... we accepted without any qualification this decision and the conditions therein contained, and this we feel, with respect, finally disposes of the South African issue until at least 1970."⁵⁹ Although certain NOCs might want to reopen this issue, this would only serve to create "a tragedy not only for South Africa's Non-White Sportsmen, but also for the whole world of Olympic Sport."⁶⁰

Attempts to contain or resolve the uproar stemming from the re-admittance of South Africa to the 1968 Games began at the April 1968 Lausanne Executive Board meeting. Brundage fended off complaints about the procedural handling of the Grenoble meetings,⁶¹ deploring "... the deep division within the IOC which threatened to wreck the Olympic Movement and which was due to the actions of some of its own members."⁶² In view of these tensions, there were only two possible solutions: to leave things as they were or not to admit South Africa, but the crisis had reached such a state that "[b]oth solutions would leave a bitter division in the IOC and in the world."⁶³ The course of action that promised the least amount of damage to either the IOC, SANOC, the NOCs, or the Mexico City Organizing Committee "would be to have

South Africa withdraw voluntarily, since then the IOC would be reasonably happy, the Mexican OCO appreciative, and SANOC relieved in not being obliged to send a team under present circumstances. SANOC would be asked to withdraw for several good reasons as it was in the interest of the IOC and the Olympic Movement and that a withdrawal would solve the desperate situation in which IOC found itself.”⁶⁴

After an extended discussion of several options to resolve the issue, and “[i]n view of all the information on the international climate received by the Executive Board at this Meeting,”⁶⁵ Brundage communicated in an urgent cablegram to IOC members, the Board had expressed the unanimous opinion “that it would be most unwise for a South African team to participate in the Games of the XIX Olympiad – therefore, the Executive Board strongly recommends that [the IOC members] endorse this unanimous proposal to withdraw the invitation to these Games. ... Please [respond] immediately by cable.”⁶⁶

The proposal was supported by a majority vote of IOC members, thus effecting the withdrawal of the invitation to SANOC to participate in the 1968 Mexico City Games. In a subsequently released public statement, Brundage could not hide his bitterness: “Ignoring completely the unsportsmanlike threats, boycotts and legal technicalities, which have no place in Olympic circles, but recognizing the explosive conditions that prevail in much of the world, and in view of the ugly violence that has already occurred, I decided to recommend the action.... It is deplorable, and sad commentary on the state of the world today, that the Olympic Games, one of the most priceless and powerful instruments of our present civilization, should be endangered by controversies of this kind.”⁶⁷ The decision may have amounted to a setback for the

IOC, but Brundage refused to accept it as a total failure: “No yielding of Olympic principles. A victory of a kind, not a defeat,”⁶⁸ he added in brackets at the bottom of the release, but even three months later, Brundage’s exasperation still had not dissipated entirely:

The world, alas, is full of injustice, aggression, violence and warfare, against which all civilized persons rebel, but this is no reason to destroy the nucleus of international cooperation and good will we have in the Olympic Movement.... If participation in sport is to be stopped every time the politicians violate the laws of humanity, there will never be any international contests. Is it not better to maintain and support the Olympic Games, one of the most priceless and powerful instruments of our present civilization and try to expand the fair play and sportsmanship of the athletic field into other areas?⁶⁹

The personal relationship between Brundage and South African IOC member Reginald Honey survived the controversy intact. Honey thanked Brundage for his help, noting that the situation would in time “work itself out.”⁷⁰ Brundage assured Honey that the Executive Board members held no grudges, reminding him: “Don’t forget that the South African [National] Olympic Committee has some friends and supporters who will protect your interests.”⁷¹

2.1 Ira Emery

Before discussing in detail the role of the IOC South Africa Commission and its visit to South Africa, both contributing factors to the controversy in 1968, the correspondence between Ira Emery and Avery Brundage on these developments merits attention. As before, Emery maintained a steady exchange of views with Brundage and other relevant players between 1964 and 1968, contributing to our

understanding of the developments leading to the 1968 crisis and the retraction of South Africa's invitation to the Mexico City Games.

Right after the 1964 Tokyo Games, Emery raised the issue of mixed teams as a possible means to resolve the impasse, since this could be an indication of change in the right direction: "I will let you know the reactions from the S.A. Government regarding the demand for mixed teams inside and outside this country. Personally, I feel there will be a change of front."⁷² Brundage also shared Emery's optimism about South African sport: "I hope it will be possible to untangle the sport and political questions soon so that we can have South Africa back in the fold before 1968."⁷³ By early November, however, Emery had become concerned about possible complications regarding the South African Olympic team, since the signals coming from the South African government remained anything but positive. The Prime Minister remained unmoved in his opposition to mixed teams, and it was thus unlikely that Minister of the Interior J. de Klerk could be prevailed upon to issue visas for a mixed team to travel and participate in the Olympics, unless a diversionary measure could be agreed upon: "There may be some way out and they will grant visas provided the team does not travel together, or compete against each other or be housed together. I do not know whether you will consider this a feasible proposition but at least if you do get the information direct from the Government, your Executive will know exactly where they stand."⁷⁴ In fact, the political situation appeared to be deteriorating since the stipulations of the Group Areas Act had just been extended to ban non-whites "from watching any sport below provincial level at the Wanderers Stadium in Johannesburg.... In all cases now, permits must be issued by the

Government department concerned to permit non-whites to attend any sports event in which Whites participate.”⁷⁵ The sport experiences of non-whites in South Africa were deteriorating, but alternative possibilities to involve non-whites in international sport still offered themselves on occasion. Emery suggested the possibility to establish an Olympic Committee in one of the South African territories that would represent non-white sportsmen throughout Africa.⁷⁶ But Brundage was concerned what the acceptability of such an option would be with regard to the Olympic principles of unifying team representation: “If South African policy is ‘When we are guests of another country we behave according to their traditions – the fact that we accept their invitations means we will adapt ourselves to their customs’, can we understand from this that South Africa will accept Olympic customs?”⁷⁷ With this in mind, SANOC President Frank Braun’s statement about the possibility of sending two teams to the Olympic Games that Emery reported to Brundage,⁷⁸ anticipated a negative response from Brundage, since the IOC would not permit two teams from one governed state.

And SANOC had other challenges to address. A resolution put forth by Black African states to suspend South Africa had to be put on the agenda of the subsequent SANOC meeting, and what the organizations saw as Reginald Honey’s shabby treatment by the Italian delegation at the previous NOC meeting had not been forgotten.⁷⁹ Brundage’s description of the incident for Emery indicates the tensions of that meeting:

Because of a personal appeal from me, the African delegates did not walk out of the meeting we had in Madrid. They had threatened to do so at the meeting held in Rome and this resulted in Mr. Honey’s

exclusion. I informed them that we operated in a more civilized fashion and suggested that they present a resolution, which would be entertained. This postponed the crisis at least until our meeting in Rome next April.⁸⁰

The issue of South Africa's presence at Olympic events clearly had to be managed with delicacy. Emery attempted to dissuade SANOC from sending delegates to the Rome meeting to advance South Africa's case. He believed that SANOC needed to openly declare itself against apartheid with a letter to the IOC before it could credibly advance any other arguments for reinstatement: "One suggestion which might be given consideration is that until such time as South Africa could abide by the ruling of the IOC (and which would quite conceivably be altered) it remains a member of the IOC without attending meetings, and with-holding an entry for the 1968 Olympic Games in Mexico."⁸¹

Emery argued that the question of South African sport first had to be resolved as an internal matter. SANOC should save the expense of sending delegates to discuss these matters with the IOC when a letter would suffice and create less antagonism. It did not help that the South African government did not remain silent about its discriminatory sport policies, especially those involving mixed sport.⁸² This stance was obviously in contradiction to the conditions laid down by the IOC, which would allow South Africa to compete in the Olympic Games provided it accepted mixed sport. Emery argued to hold the issue in abeyance: "...until such time as South Africa can obey the conditions which have been imposed by the IOC as far as mixed sport is concerned, South Africa should state it will not take part in the Mexico City Games and any future Olympic Games until they can follow the conditions imposed. This, I think

would save a lot of embarrassment at your meeting and should at least permit South Africa to remain a member of the IOC.”⁸³ Unable to identify other options, Brundage agreed. The IOC had to maintain its principle of non-discrimination, but SANOC could not defy its government.⁸⁴

The impending, much anticipated arrival of the fact-finding South Africa Commission did little to lessen Emery’s skepticism. The Commission “... would be shown what is being done for the non-whites but you will not see any competing against whites; on some occasions non-whites are not permitted to watch sporting fixtures held by whites.”⁸⁵ In view of the government’s rigid and unyielding attitude, the resolution would lead to an organizational convolution that the IOC would surely find unacceptable: “The Minister will not agree to a mixed committee and a non-white committee will discuss matters concerning the non-whites; a white committee will discuss matters concerning the whites, but both will be under the chairmanship of Mr. Braun, but not at the same time.”⁸⁶ In rejecting such an option, Brundage reiterated that the separation of sports and politics would not allow the IOC to accept a resolution that had so clearly been adjusted to political circumstances: “... government policy is a political matter and ... it is the athletes of all colors that are suffering.”⁸⁷

A new wrinkle was added to this debate by the South African government decision to form a Department of Sport. To anticipate the degree of political interference this could cause for South African Olympic sports, Emery asked Brundage about precedents of government interference with NOC matters in recent IOC history.⁸⁸ The Argentine Olympic Committee had been suspended for just such an incident,

Brundage replied: "When the politicians have taken control our only recourse has been to withdraw recognition from the Committee until it regained its independence and freedom."⁸⁹ To forestall such a development repeating itself in South Africa, Brundage decided to initiate contact with the South African government and discuss the idea of sending a fact-finding mission to the country.⁹⁰ Braun asked that the SAC visit be postponed to give the government time to adjust, where possible, its approach.⁹¹ "You will note," Emery followed up, "that the Prime Minister said he 'would give consideration to creating facilities for non-Whites to take part in the Olympic Games, but only within the framework of the principle of separation'."⁹² To make its case, SANOC firmly planned to send delegates to the Tehran meeting, a strategy that Emery considered to be distinctly unhelpful and counter-productive. Brundage argued that not all was lost as yet: "Our sole interest is that the National Olympic Committee is permitted to function according to Olympic rules, which provide that the Games are open to all and no discrimination of any kind is allowed.... It is not likely that a settlement will be reached before our Committee of Investigation visits South Africa, although if President Braun comes to Tehran we will probably hear his report."⁹³ In any case, Brundage noted, in view of misleading media reports coming out of South Africa which stated that the Prime Minister was trying to accommodate non-white sport in South Africa, no decision would be made until after the Commission had submitted its report.⁹⁴

By now, Brundage had accepted the fact that "... the Government has gone as far as it can go in trying to satisfy the Olympic authorities.... A great deal will depend on the attitude of the black sport organizations which I understand are not unfavorable to

the procedure which the South African [National] Olympic Committee offers to follow.”⁹⁵ The Commission, Emery thought, had left a favourable impression in South Africa,⁹⁶ but Brundage was concerned that some NOCs had reached a decision before the Commission submitted its report: “There will undoubtedly be a bitter debate at our session in Grenoble since, unfortunately, some have made up their mind without waiting for the report.”⁹⁷

In the aftermath of the IOC’s reversal its erstwhile decision to reinstate SANOC, Emery felt apologetic about the attacks on Brundage coming from certain members of SANOC:

I am very sorry that there has been such an attack made on you by Braun ... but I can assure you that as far as I am concerned I know how genuine you were when you were in South Africa and discussed with me the possibilities of the outcome of the voting at the IOC. I am certain that you wanted us in and I feel equally certain that your fear of unpleasantness to the South African Team if it had to go to Mexico must have influenced you a lot in your thinking. Some of the statements made by Mr. Braun are quite hysterical, particularly the one where he stated that thousands of Non-Whites are in training for athletics in this country.⁹⁸

Brundage remained unfazed by the criticism directed at him: “I can assure you that any other action taken at the meeting would have been far worse from the South African point of view....[SANOC’s] invitation was withdrawn because of world conditions.”⁹⁹ In any case, Brundage noted, he acted out of a concern for the safety of the South African team at the Mexico Olympics: “My name would never have been attached to the cablegram sent to the members of the IOC asking them to withdraw the invitation to SANOC had I not been completely convinced that it would both be unwise and unsafe for the South Africa team to appear in Mexico.”¹⁰⁰

3. The IOC South Africa Commission

The IOC's South Africa Commission (SAC) was first discussed by the IOC at the 1966 Rome General Session.¹⁰¹ The official delegation was formally announced by Brundage during the Executive Board meetings in Mexico City that same year.¹⁰² The announcement was met with some concern about the utility of such a mission. Kenyan IOC member Reginald Alexander asked: "Is there any evidence of the Olympic Sportsmen in South Africa merely 'taking cover' behind 'Government policy' without any effort on their part to achieve compliance with our Olympic principles and rules; we cannot expect them to break the law but there is much they can and must do, towards integration in Sports Administration and Competition."¹⁰³

In the early stages of the selection process, it was not certain whether Brundage himself would be a member of the Commission to reinforce its clout. Alexander wrote to Johan Westerhoff: "As I understand it, the proposal is that Sir Ade Ademola and myself, accompanied by you as [IOC] Secretary General, should visit South Africa and that if, during such a visit, we consider progress is possible then Mr. Brundage would join us in South Africa for final deliberations."¹⁰⁴ Brundage postponed talking to Alexander about the proposed visit to South Africa until the Executive Board meeting in Mexico City.¹⁰⁵ By then, Westerhoff sounded more positive on developments in South Africa: "On the question of the disapproval of multi-racial universities and Political Parties the South African Government appears to be having second thoughts. This might indicate that they are prepared to be more Liberal in sport. But I just do not really know, and no one will, until they are faced with a real test."¹⁰⁶

Once Alexander was officially appointed to lead the SAC, his first order of business was to make arrangements for safe and unimpeded travel throughout South Africa. Concerns, as was mentioned previously, centred on the person of Sir Ade Ademola, a black SAC member, and they were heightened by statements coming from SANOC Vice President Arthur Foster, who had expressed his approval of the existing status quo. All commission members were to be accommodated appropriately, Alexander insisted – identical living quarters, and identical freedoms to move and act as needed to complete the mission.¹⁰⁷

Ademola initially declined to join the Commission.¹⁰⁸ Foster's remarks clearly had a damaging effect,¹⁰⁹ and Alexander requested an official retraction by SANOC President Braun on behalf of his organization "before the Sub-Committee commences its work."¹¹⁰ Seeking to calm the situation, Braun complied. He guaranteed freedom of movement as long as the Commission did not seek talks with the banned Communists. In addition, Braun made it known through the newspaper that Foster's views did not represent SANOC's official position. "I hope that by that time we arrive there," Alexander noted, "they will have disposed of [Foster]."¹¹¹ SANOC did indeed disassociate itself from Foster.¹¹²

By mid-May Brundage himself sought to convince Ademola to join the Commission, concerned about the credibility of a Commission without a non-white member: "If you are not on the commission ... there may be criticism of the fact that the black African countries are not represented."¹¹³ Although European himself, Lord Killanin was for a time considered to be a viable alternate, but he himself was skeptical: "Reading in the papers I feel that Ademola will be out of the running with his own internal

problems. I might say I am not anxious to go on the commission to South Africa,”¹¹⁴ but a few days later, Ademola reluctantly agreed to serve on the SAC: “... I must confess I share the views of my Government that considering my position as the Chief Justice of Nigeria should anything untoward happen as a result of the behaviour of the South African Government (or any South African) to me when I am in that country, it will cause a great embarrassment to Nigeria. I should hate to be the centre of any dispute which is likely to spark off any bitterness in race relationship between Africans (blacks) and the whites. ... Somehow, I have not the necessary confidence in the South African Government.”¹¹⁵ Ademola would join the Commission, contingent on SANOC providing assurances for proper security.

With Alexander busy attempting to retain Ademola’s services, it fell to Westerhoff to engage with SAN-ROC. He met its co-founder Chris de Broglio who provided a list of officials the Commission should meet on its tour, but not all seemed well in South Africa. “They [SAN-ROC] seem to be very afraid that this list may get into the hands of people other than you and me, so I ask you to deal very carefully with it.”¹¹⁶ Alexander had encountered a similar attitude on a trip to South Africa during the preceding year: “I, too, had a list of addresses of officials of ‘non-racial’ organizations but I found them reluctant to make contact. Therefore, my advice is that you write now from Lausanne to the names with which you have been supplied by Brutus and de Broglio; this will, I consider perhaps give them the confidence and assurance of having received a letter direct from the IOC Headquarters and will also give them time to think.”¹¹⁷ It would be advantageous to suggest to those contacts to “[t]ry and keep themselves informed about the movements of the commission so that we can contact them quickly when

we are in South Africa.”¹¹⁸ Much as Alexander encouraged input from SAN-ROC, he was still put off by the organization’s use of the word mark ‘Olympic,’ and he did not consider SAN-ROC’s membership claim of 70,000 credible: “The Africans are the majority of the population (they number about 10 million) and it is important that we establish who is talking for them. Therefore, please ask de Broglia for an estimated breakdown of the 70,000 into races or Communities.”¹¹⁹

But Secretary General Westerhoff’s efforts as a member of the Commission did not last long. Dutch IOC member Herman van Karnebeek recommended that Westerhoff be excluded from the three-man Commission. He was seen as too close to Brundage, and he was not a full-fledged IOC member. Lastly, in view of Westerhoff’s Dutch origin, and the South African colonial power and government consisting of Afrikaners (Dutch descendants), it would be preferable to protect Westerhoff from potential political defamation.¹²⁰ Karnebeek stressed that the fact-finding commission was too important for such distractions. Brundage took the suggestions seriously, and indicated to Killanin to be ready to join the Commission instead, contingent on Ademola also accepting the call.¹²¹ Brundage proposed that the Commission should consist of Alexander, Ademola, and Killanin. If Ademola could not participate, Jan Staubo from Norway would take his place.¹²² Ademola, for his part, deferred to the President and Executive Board on any decision concerning Westerhoff’s membership.¹²³

Westerhoff was in agreement with this arrangement, since he had become convinced “that the Secretary General should be neutral and undisputable as well as the IOC organization.”¹²⁴ Killanin then suggested that Westerhoff might join the

Commission on its travels, not as a member, “but [he] would purely go in a reporting capacity and not ... speak or open his mouth. I think it is essential for him to be present to listen to all the facts but I quite agree with our colleague from the Netherlands that it would be unwise to use his own nationality or that he should be directly involved in any questioning, etc.”¹²⁵ Alexander echoed this suggestion, but Killanin remained cool to the idea.¹²⁶

Killanin agreed to join SAC, but he was concerned that he might have his own credibility problem to consider, inasmuch as he had been a sponsor of an anti-apartheid movement in Ireland; he felt that an announcement should be issued indicating that he would not be biased.¹²⁷ He then proceeded to demand a much broader preparatory information-gathering approach. He suggested obtaining various lists and diverse information on South African laws, and requested that Brundage define a very specific objective for the trip.¹²⁸ Killanin assumed that such strict arrangements would be necessary to assure efficiency: “I would have thought it very important for the Executive to discuss the South African report which I think will take much more time and work than anyone realizes, well before the Lausanne meeting,”¹²⁹ rescheduled for December 1967.

Looking ahead, Killanin even gave thought to a media release strategy to be adopted as the Commission went about its work, noting that “the release of the news of the Commission should be announced as soon as they are certain, to avoid any leakages.”¹³⁰ At the same time, staying ahead of the news cycle did not mean that the investigation had to proceed in a hurried manner: “There was a suggestion of an Executive meeting at the end of September, but I do not think we should be hurried

too much as we may well wish to digest some facts and have to circulate the final draft of the report between the three of us. It would be fatal to be hurried in one's judgement and no final decision can be taken until the full Session at Grenoble although the Executive may wish to ask for further information."¹³¹

Westerhoff was now off the Commission, but as Secretary General he maintained his contacts with SANOC representatives, especially on the pivotal issues of Commission security and unhindered travel. L.M. Francey, SANOC's Secretary General, offered positive assurances: "The members of your delegation will be able to speak to or contact anyone with the same freedom as any citizen of this country and as any visitor to this country.... In regard to your references to assurances from our Government, we feel we should mention that your delegation will be received by the South African National Olympic Committee, which is an independent and autonomous body and not by the Government."¹³² This did not mean, she pointed out, that the Government would be entirely unconcerned: "..., it should be pointed out that it is customary for the Government of this country to ensure the safety, well-being and dignity of foreign visitors. I, therefore, have no hesitation in assuring you that this will apply equally to your delegation to whom every courtesy will be extended and within the framework of the laws of this country, no hindrance will be placed on the movements of the members of the delegation."¹³³

With all preparations completed, a press release about the work of the SAC was published. It described the Commission's purpose and remit as follows:

The IOC expects this commission to make a thorough investigation of amateur sport in South Africa. It is to report facts, not to make recommendations. One knows that apartheid is the policy of the

South African government. The IOC is concerned with whether or not Olympic regulations can be met, and every athlete, regardless of race, will have an opportunity to participate in the Olympic Games. It wants to know the attitude of the athletes themselves as well as the opinion of the amateur sports organizations of all races. The investigation will cover different cities and sections of the country, the available facilities and the number of coaches and trainers, what kind of competitions are arranged, the extent of sport participation by various sections of the population, and the different kinds of Olympic sports engaged in by the different races.... The International Olympic Committee will study the report prepared by the investigation Commission, and it will take a decision on the participation of a South African delegation in the 1968 Olympic Games at its session in Grenoble from 1st to 3rd February 1968.¹³⁴

With the trip to South Africa less than a month away, Killanin reminded Westerhoff of organizational loose ends, such as a secretary who was not South African; access to money; documentation of the rules of SANOC, white and non-white organizations, and affiliated associations; and, notification that the public had the opportunity to provide evidence directly to the Commission.¹³⁵ Further, Killanin stressed the importance of Dennis Brutus and his people to the Commission; he wanted to make sure that Brutus was given the details of the SAC's whereabouts and contact information at any time.¹³⁶

Killanin's energetic preparation for SAC's trip resulted in his appointment to the Chairmanship by Brundage. Despite Brundage's confidence in him, Killanin remained worried, about the Commission's reliance on SANOC assistance: "... I was very concerned that we were only to have secretariat from the South African [National] Olympic Committee which would make it quite impossible to prepare a report which must, in the first instance, be of a confidential nature as we thrash out the facts. I have spoken to the Secretary General and it is now agreed that someone from Lausanne will join us."¹³⁷ The same concern was raised about SAC's capability to make its

presence and purpose known to South Africans: "... I would like a note," Alexander communicated to Braun, "stating how you propose that all shades of opinion in Olympic Sport in your country should know of the Commission, and the opportunity they will have personally to appear before the Commission.... The Secretary General sent you a questionnaire early in the year. The replies to this are now urgently required."¹³⁸ Not wanting solely to rely on SANOC's intermediary help, Alexander suggested to Westerhoff to use a list supplied by SANOC and containing names and addresses of persons in South Africa prepared to give evidence on behalf of 'non-racial' sporting organizations, to write to each of them individually, inviting them to submit evidence, and offering them a meeting with the Commission in one of the scheduled cities on the trip.¹³⁹ Braun, on the other hand, was quoted in newspapers saying that only representatives of national and provincial sports bodies might give evidence to the committee.¹⁴⁰ "It is important," Alexander rejoined, "that no one in your country who wishes to discuss with us should have any excuse whatsoever for being unable to make contact."¹⁴¹ Braun, in response, assured Alexander that there was sufficient publicity to encourage people to approach SAC.¹⁴²

Finally, on the eve of SAC's departure to South Africa, Brundage provided a firm directive that rigidly placed the focus on sport-related issues:

If we are to judge apartheid per se, it is not necessary to send a commission at all. Our concern is with the National Olympic Committee and what it is doing to comply with Olympic regulations, especially Articles 24 and 25.... We had an analogous situation in 1936, when most of the world condemned Nazism and many wanted to remove the Games from Berlin. Also, after the II World War many of those who were against Communism wanted to keep the Eastern countries out of the Games.... We must not become involved in

political issues, nor permit the Olympic Games to be used as a tool or as a weapon for extraneous causes.¹⁴³

Upon the trip's completion, Killanin provided Brundage with a brief synopsis of SAC's activities in South Africa and an update on the report's status. By the beginning of December 1967, Killanin reported that the final draft was complete.¹⁴⁴ Killanin likewise kept Braun updated on the fact that South Africa had been discussed at a recent Executive Board meeting and that after the report was received by all IOC members and subsequently discussed at Grenoble, a postal vote would determine SANOC's fate.¹⁴⁵ He also notified Braun that SAC was still waiting on some documentation requested from South African NSFs. This information would have to be added to the report verbally at the 1968 Grenoble Sessions.¹⁴⁶

SAC's report numbered over 200 pages; Killanin emphasized its main thrust as follows:

I would like to report that in general everybody we have seen, with perhaps five exceptions, have said that they want to come back into the Olympic Games and accept the Tehran five points but there are variations, from those who think it is technically impossible, to those who say 'Will we really be represented, it is equal, but the Chairman is European.' I don't think any single group, except possibly one section, have said this, but certain individuals in groups have expressed that view. As far as I can recall there have not been any, the only ones that have been in specific sports was weightlifting, which was explained to Mr. F. Braun. I think the decision that we made on Friday night was certainly the correct one in your interests, that of you being with us. When I left we raised the question of the Constitutions and I am glad to say that I have them all except from the Amateur Athletic Union.... We will contact the key International Federations (a) out of courtesy and (b) also to report to them that we have seen unaffiliated bodies but we have made it clear to all the unaffiliated bodies that whatever is accomplished by the IOC they still cannot compete unless they are affiliated internationally and that is something over which we have no control whatsoever. We only recognise one international Federation and everyone must be

affiliated to it. That is as far as I can go on that side of it.... We have had a great weight of evidence of people objecting to Brutus representing them outside the country. There have also been groups who support him. So this is our intention. If he had not been seen originally by the IOC, but he has been seen, and think that in all justice we have to see him. We have not yet decided that we all see him or only one of us and perhaps Westerhoff.¹⁴⁷

In reference to the postal vote based on SAC's report, Alexander suggested to Brundage, "... that there must be a specific motion of the Executive Board upon which members must decide. To leave it merely to a YES/NO on the existing suspension of the South African National Olympic Committee will lead to confusion as it is not as simple as that. I have my idea of an appropriate motion but then that it is none of my business."¹⁴⁸ In addition, Killanin explained to Westerhoff: "... the wording of the Resolution must be very clear and very simple as the Executive agreed it would be purely based on permission to make entries for the Games at Mexico City. The whole situation would be subject to review after it was seen that the selection for Mexico worked fairly."¹⁴⁹ It was Alexander's recommended draft of the resolution that Killanin endorsed to base the postal vote on.¹⁵⁰

Ademola, anxious to avoid any controversy about the vote, added some comments on the subject of the postal vote, advising SAC members to refrain from moving forward any motions at the upcoming meeting: "Our duty to my mind is to answer questions which members may like to put to us on our Report, which naturally brings us into the discussion.... I think it should be left to the Executive to formulate its own plans as to how a ballot should be effected without any confusion."¹⁵¹ Killanin also agreed with Ademola on the necessity to recuse the Commission in respect of making any motions on the report at the meeting: "Our object is to do whatever is best for the

Olympic Movement and that is why I think the wording of the Resolution should not be weighed one way or the other by the Commission.... I feel if members of the IOC cannot make up their minds on the report and on the summary nothing much can be done about it.”¹⁵²

SAC’s desire for transparency and objectivity was commendable. Its thorough process provided a grounded report towards assisting the development of an informed decision. Now it was in the hands of the IOC Executive Board and General Assembly to leverage the report in deciding South Africa’s destiny with regard to the 1968 Mexico City Games.

4. IOC and NOC Opinions

The correspondence from IOC and NOC members to Avery Brundage related to the South African issue mushroomed in the months leading up to the 1968 Mexico City Games,¹⁵³ more than likely energized by important actors such as Killanin underscoring the importance of this particular vote: “In regard to South Africa,” he noted, “I think it is very important when the results are announced that it is made very clear on what people were voting, i.e. the details of Hugh Weir’s Resolution.... A direct vote of yes or no could well be misinterpreted in the world as an approval of apartheid rather than the qualifying motion on which we are voting.”¹⁵⁴ The result of the historic vote was 36 to 25 in favour of readmitting South Africa to the Mexico City Games.¹⁵⁵ This decision reverberated through the Olympic world. Indeed, it took many IOC and NOC members by surprise.

Concerned to prevent even more controversy than there had been already, Reginald Alexander advised Frank Braun to remain quiet on the issue: "Pipe down.... You have got what you want, for the moment. Now is the time for tact, calm and statesmanship. Let the others do the shouting if they want."¹⁵⁶ 'Shouting' was an appropriate description of what happened between the time of the vote in Grenoble and the 1968 Mexico City Games. Giulio Onesti claimed that the decision had caused unexpected reactions among the majority of the IOC members: "The evolution of this situation throughout the world is such today that no doubt seems to remain that the international Olympic Movement is in danger and that its very existence is seriously threatened."¹⁵⁷ Onesti believed that the whole of Africa and parts of Asia would forego participation in the upcoming Games. He wanted Brundage urgently to convene a formal IOC Extraordinary Session to reconsider the question of South African participation in the Olympic Games.¹⁵⁸ General Vladimir Stoytchev, IOC member for Bulgaria, supported Onesti's request. "You have probably heard and seen the repercussion which the IOC's decision about South Africa has had in the whole world. It may have unpleasant consequences for the future of our Olympic Movement.... Therefore I beg you to convoke the IOC members to an extraordinary session in order to reconsider that question."¹⁵⁹

South Africa's re-admittance to the Olympic Games had again become a front page international story. Two sides naturally developed – those who supported the decision and those who opposed it. The 'yes' vote was influenced by the SAC report or was convinced in the course of the hours of subsequent discussion. Even SAC Chairman Killanin who was surprised by the degree of media attention, did not

anticipate the attention he received from the media. He told Brundage: "In regard to South Africa, I have had innumerable offers to appear on television, etc., even, I believe, at the risk of my amateur status but I consider as chairman of the Committee and as your representative I should not express any views although I may have to make a short statement to my own national committee if any questions are asked."¹⁶⁰

Killanin probably felt it a challenge to refrain from offering public evaluations of the South African situation; he privately confided to Brundage that the Commission's trip left him feeling "more strongly than ever that what the South African Government is doing is very evil."¹⁶¹ He nonetheless remained steadfastly loyal to Brundage and the IOC.

In the end, it was the Chairman of the Mexican Organizing Committee of the Games of the XIX Olympiad, Pedro Ramírez Vázquez, along with IOC members, Marte R. Gómez and José de Jesus Clark, who convinced Brundage to revisit the South African vote. They invoked the "lofty objectives of the international Olympic Movement... an expression of a fundamental conviction of the permanent validity of the basic principles of the Olympic Games, a belief in the equality of man, in his freedom and in respect for human dignity."¹⁶² It was "alien circumstances" that had harmed the IOC's ability to comply with established formal procedures in this case, and the Mexico City Organizing Committee thus was entitled "to appeal an agreement that has notoriously been a cause of controversy concerning the Olympic Games, and which is of a non-technical nature," in this case the vote that repealed the veto against SANOC. The Organizing Committee, wrote Vazquez, "...wishe[d] to reiterate that the manifestations that have occurred throughout the world and the threat of possible

abstentions from the Games are clear evidence that the basic principle of non-racial discrimination, as stated in Olympic Rule No. 1 has been questioned.”¹⁶³ To prevent further harm to the forthcoming Games, a review of the repeal was urgently required.

Since the request came from the Mexico Organizing Committee, Brundage had to give the issue some thought. Meanwhile, Alexander advised Brundage to remain calm and avoid ill-conceived action: “Now is the time to avoid precipitate words or actions, anywhere in the world that could hinder progress. ... in Grenoble I said that there would be uproar in Africa for about two months; wait for the dust to settle! ... What I ask is that you do your utmost to prevent any of our colleagues creating more difficulties or impossible situations; your leadership is vital now.... Braun must be fixed and quickly. He is a menace.”¹⁶⁴

Alexander’s opinion was not shared by all his IOC colleagues. Onesti continued to request an extraordinary session,¹⁶⁵ gaining support from colleagues such as his Italian IOC colleague Giorgio De Stefani, who advised Brundage that the call for an Extraordinary Session should more suitably come from the President rather than from a vote by the membership: “The Government, the Press and the public opinion [in Italy are] unanimously criticizing the vote of Grenoble and I believe it is my duty to inform [you] about it.... Our colleague Mr. Onesti has informed me that he has made a formal request to you to convene an extraordinary Session of the IOC to re-examine the present situation as a whole. I would like to support his request.”¹⁶⁶

But there were certainly supporters of the Grenoble vote. The Marquess of Exeter attempted to encourage like-minded members to make public statements against a boycott of the Mexico City Games, provided the stipulations of the initial resolution of

readmittance had been fulfilled: "I see that a number of countries including Japan and Norway have stated their intention of going to Mexico, and the British Olympic Association issued a statement yesterday noting that a multi-racial team from South Africa would be present in Mexico and stating that they had received an invitation and had accepted it."¹⁶⁷

Brundage, however, did not sit idle. Rather than wait for NOCs to accept or reject the invitation to the 1968 Mexico City Games, he met with Ramírez Vázquez, Gómez, and Clark in Chicago, and called a special meeting of the IOC Executive Board.¹⁶⁸ For the time being, however, this did not quell the media furor, as Alexander reported from Kenya: "There is now a real danger that expediency will encourage and capitulate to extremism. The issue up to now has been 'mixed trials' inside South Africa but this could now easily extend to a demand that the IOC must first change the Government of South Africa!"¹⁶⁹

Hugh Weir, Australian IOC member, responsible for the wording of the Grenoble resolution, was pleased at the final result of the mail vote. However, he was shocked of the African attitude. He complained to Brundage:

It is quite evident that far from a sporting attitude, their thinking is governed by political motives. I go so far as to say that few, if any of the African N.O.C.'s [sic] made a decision of their own volition. I am convinced that they were told what to do by their respective Governments.... The inconsistency of their combined attitude lies in the fact that in alleged protest against racial discrimination, they are now practicing political discrimination against South Africa. Which is the worst?¹⁷⁰

Weir opposed a review of the Grenoble decision, threatening to leave the IOC if the vote were repealed. He, for one, was particularly suspicious of the motives of many of

the African NOCs in joining threats to boycott the Mexico City Games: “[H]ow many of the 40 odd N.O.C.’s [sic] loudly announcing their withdrawal would have participated at Mexico City next October under [n]ormal circumstances? I venture to suggest that quite a number of the smaller and weaker States would have been absentees for the reasons that they have no athletes of sufficient calibre or they have no money to waste.”¹⁷¹ And even if those African NOCs were to make good on their threat, there was no reason for the Organizing Committee to be overly concerned. “Do they not realise that even if the whole 40 nations do withdraw, they will still have representation from 80 of the most powerful athletic nations in the world including Australia.”¹⁷²

Weir’s sense of the situation was shared by some, Marquess Exeter among them. In preparation for the upcoming IOC Executive Board meeting called by Brundage, Exeter wanted the IOC President to look at the laws of procedure and possible angles of international law.¹⁷³ He also forecasted the logistics of the meeting and possible votes for and against, and suggested another postal vote if things progressed to another motion. However, Exeter believed the meeting should be led by three questions: Will the Games go on? Should a General Session be called? Should there be postal vote?¹⁷⁴ To prevent another General Session, Exeter raised the danger of Onesti getting enough signatures for an Extraordinary Session before the planned Executive Board meeting. However, Danish IOC member, Ivar Vind, pointed out to Brundage, the chances of preventing an Extraordinary Session were becoming slimmer by the day: “[I] strongly believe every day you delay sending a firm circular letter will give

disloyal IOC members the chance to wreck the Olympic Movement. You simply must take the lead and forcefully defend the results of postal voting.”¹⁷⁵

Vind had first-hand experience with perceived disloyalty among IOC members. Onesti was working hard to collect the one-third votes insuring Extraordinary General Session. But Vind believed Onesti was not applying Article 18 properly since it seemed nonsensical to Vind that a quorum of one-third of the votes should be in a position to repeal a vote at will.¹⁷⁶ Anyhow, Denmark, in any event, supported the IOC decision and from what he could tell, so would Finland, Norway and Iceland. Vind concluded with four suggestions to help diffuse the situation: (1) Send a circular letter to all IOC members, possibly showing disapproval of disloyalty shown through decisions made; (2) Send a circular letter to NOC Presidents to fill them in on the exact details about the Commission’s report and wording of resolution; (3) Tell the Mexican organizing committee and NOC to stay quiet; and, (4) Tell SANOC to stay quiet and refrain from circulating any letters.¹⁷⁷

To help expedite the Executive Board meeting, the Mexican delegation sent urgent telegrams to the Board members to organize the meeting as soon as possible.¹⁷⁸ A frustrated Vind wrote to Brundage: “I am really getting sick with all the IOC members who primarily are concerned with feathering their own nests and only regard their IOC membership as a matter for prestige and social standing.”¹⁷⁹ The misrepresentation of the details of the Grenoble decision in the media was also a nuisance to Vind. He insisted that the IOC must do better to inform the public. In preparation for the Executive Board meeting, Clark notified the IOC Executive Board that Brundage called the meeting to consider the appeal from Ramírez Vázquez by

exercising Article 41 of the *Olympic Charter*.¹⁸⁰ The Executive Board, he offered, could resolve the appeal without calling an extraordinary plenary session. Clark reminded them where the differences were in relation to voting for or against the Grenoble motion between those who voted on the stipulations in principle enshrined in Article 1, and those who were only focussed on expediently resolving the problems posed by a specific case, that is, focussed “on eliminating discrimination in the specific representation of a country at the Olympic Games, which in essence, is contradictory to the Ideal and does not offer a definite and permanent solution.”¹⁸¹

Konstantin Andrianov, IOC Vice President, likewise, was convinced that the initial decision had been wrong; he laid much of the blame at Brundage’s feet: “We are at the moment on the brink of splitting of the international Olympic Movement, the unity of which you fully supported verbally many times.... The international importance of this social phenomenon is too great to be offered a sacrifice to those who violate the main principle of the humanism that is the equality of all the races.”¹⁸²

Andrianov finished his letter by mentioning that the USSR was unlikely to send athletes if South Africa was admitted to the 1968 Mexico City Games.¹⁸³ Andrianov copied his letter to all IOC members.¹⁸⁴ It claimed that South Africa continued to violate the *Olympic Charter*, and therefore, forfeited its rights to participate in the Olympic Games. Further, SAC’s report confirmed racial discrimination and the procedure and order of voting for South Africa’s readmission were contrary to the *Olympic Charter’s* protocol.¹⁸⁵

Hungarian IOC member Árpád Csanádi likewise wrote to Brundage in favour of rescinding the original decision:

The report of the IOC delegation having visited South Africa also reflects the reality that owing to the policy of apartheid in force as a state law in South Africa the lasting noble aims of non-discrimination of the IOC cannot be enforced when composing the South African Olympic team. Simultaneously it is also clear that the South Africa National Olympic Committee is not able to conform its activity with the IOC rules as a result of the apartheid policy.... Consequently not only its “promise” of doubtful value concerning its participation at the Olympic Games can be considered as debatable, but, also the activity of the South African National Olympic Committee as a whole, which does not meet the requirements or the ideas of the IOC.¹⁸⁶

To prepare for this wave of opposition, Brundage studied Robert’s Rules of Order, directed Honey’s attention to the possibility of legal action, and mentioned the possibility of sending Westerhoff to Africa to “buy more time.”¹⁸⁷ During his attempt to contain the situation, Brundage admitted: “Many of our difficulties, as usual, come from our own members. Something will have to be done about this.”¹⁸⁸ Brundage also updated Onesti on the special Executive Board meeting to encourage those who opposed South Africa’s Olympic involvement to refrain from drawing attention to the situation, “... I think all members should defer public statements or actions until they hear from the Executive Board.”¹⁸⁹

German IOC member, Dr. Georg von Opel, emphasized the fact that the IOC had neither the authority nor the influence to involve itself in the internal political situation of a country, and had to observe the internal integrity of its own decision-making procedures. The procedural argument in favour of retaining the original decision, were clear: “.... the statutes of the IOC are only then practicable if they are limited to that sphere of operation for which an IOC may only issue statutes, and that is with respect to the intercourse between the Olympic family of nations and the performance of the Games.... Since all conditions of the IOC statutes are met, South

Africa must be admitted.”¹⁹⁰ This, he continued, certainly did not mean that the IOC “by re-admitting South Africa identif[ied] itself with the racialism in that country nor does it identify itself with the political system of such countries whose teams are admitted to the games and which are dictatorially governed.”¹⁹¹ The IOC therefore, had to “clarify the sphere of operation of its statutes in the next session. Who is then not willing to submit to the only reasonable and practicable rules of the Games and thinks he can extort the IOC, has to accept the consequences and withdraw.”¹⁹²

Exeter concurred with von Opel’s evaluation. First, as von Opel had pointed out, Article 1 referred only to the Olympic Games themselves; the IOC should never make eligibility dependent on governments and their internal laws. Second, Article 24 stated that they must abide by rules, but it did not state that they must break the laws of their own countries, even though an effort must be made for change. Lastly, Article 20 outlined conditions where the President could call for a postal vote between meetings, but there was nothing in the rules to indicate that the IOC General membership itself could not call one.¹⁹³

Prince Francois-Joseph de Liechtenstein offered a more pragmatic evaluation of the issue, noting that “moral indignation concerning the invitation of the South Africans [was] groundless considering how many athletes from countries governed by dictatorial regimes with unlimited power over the individual attend the Olympic Games.”¹⁹⁴ With similar pragmatism, he expressed a preference for the Executive Board of the IOC to resolve the issue. “This seems to me preferable to a convocation of the IOC at this point, which, I fear, might turn into a worldwide sensation, detrimental to our aims for friendship and peace amongst youth of the world.”¹⁹⁵

Perhaps, Exeter continued his deliberations, part of the virulent reaction to the South African issue was a lack of understanding of the details. He wondered if Brundage should distribute a fact sheet emphasizing that South Africa was never suspended; that SANOC was not allowed to enter a team in Tokyo because they did not fulfill certain conditions; that neither was it the IOC's remit to deal with governments, nor were participating athletes responsible for their laws; the IOC only determined conditions under which they could participate; lastly, the fact sheet should point out SAC's evaluation that South Africa had met the conditions, and the conditions for participation in the Games were accepted by the overwhelming number of non-whites.¹⁹⁶ Useful as such a leaflet might have been, procedural questions reaching well beyond such a fact sheet were being raised.

Reginald Alexander wanted to know what authority an Organizing Committee had to withhold invitations from specific NOCs, possibly in contravention of decisions made by the IOC. "Once this game starts it opens wide the possibility of any Organising Committee avoiding an invitation to one or more National Olympic Committees for reasons of its own and with the object of influencing a decision. Imperfection is everywhere, all of us must strive to do better, and be given the chance to do so."¹⁹⁷ In responding to von Opel, and touching on arguments also raised by Alexander, Brundage admitted that it was impossible to expect all IOC members to act independent of political pressures. "This is a constant source of danger that we have to tolerate if we are to unite the world of sport. The issue now is whether the politicians or sportsmen are going to control the Olympic Games. It is as simple as

that. Our rules, alas, pertain solely to the Olympic Games as you say and not to countries, otherwise it might be a better world.”¹⁹⁸

Letters of support of the original motion continued to arrive in Brundage’s mailbox. Prince George William of Hanover, President of the International Olympic Academy, argued that the decision to readmit South Africa was made after much discussion and a second vote would be inappropriate. He was not supportive of reopening the South African issue, since a second vote would, “... weaken the authority of the International Olympic Committee and create a precedence for any other decision where the minority might take advantage of this example. The functioning of the International Olympic Committee would then become hopelessly difficult and still more expensive for the members.”¹⁹⁹ Though the strength of the IOC was in its solidarity, the feeling of loyalty was not necessarily shared by all NOCs, as evidenced by a letter to Westerhoff from the NOC of India: “... a country like South Africa which does not follow the Olympic Charter inside its boundaries amongst its own people, has no right to take part in the Olympic Games merely because it has agreed to send a few coloured people in its team. The method of selection of these coloured people is not in accordance with the Olympic Charter which is totally against any kind of racial discrimination.”²⁰⁰

Under ideal conditions, the priorities of the IOC and NOCs would align; however, the interpretation and application of “priorities” varied, especially where political orientations did not correspond to traditional IOC interpretations of the rules and regulations. Exactly this thought perplexed Vind. Writing Brundage from Denmark, he observed:

I simply cannot see how we can change what was decided upon in Grenoble. Whatever the world opinion is, I am convinced that we have chosen the right path – it's only bad that more people cannot or will not see it. Our job as servant to the Olympic Movement is not to destroy but to build up. We have succeeded in obtaining concessions which nobody else has been able to get, and we have therefore decided to give the white and the non-white athletes of South Africa the chance to prove themselves in a mixed team at the Olympic Games in Mexico City. I am sure you will agree with me that members of the Executive Board, at their next meeting, cannot possibly change this decision!! ... If we bend before political pressure and if we change our decision made in Grenoble, it will be a disaster and a terrible blow to the cause of the Olympic Movement. A blow from which I am convinced we might not recover nor possibly even survive.²⁰¹

While Vind argued on political grounds, Onesti adopted a formal perspective, pointing out that the issue was simply a matter of the proper application of rules and regulations, especially Articles 1, 24, and 25. Since South Africa, he wrote Brundage, was not able to incorporate in its statute, Article 1, the South Africa question,

... should not have been brought up for examination at the Grenoble Session.... In fact, the resolution of the IOC authorising the South African NOC to present a team at the Mexico City Games is legally absurd. In effect, either that NOC is considered to be 'recognised' in accordance with Art. 24, in which case its right to 'enter' a team for the Olympic Games derives automatically from the first paragraph of Art. 24, and the IOC Assembly cannot either attribute or deny it such a right. Or, on the other hand, it may be considered that that NOC cannot enter a team in the Games, failing a special authorisation from the IOC Assembly, thereby admitting that the NOC is not legitimate to make such an entry.... By the fact of departing from the solemn principles of the IOC Regulations, a political act has been committed. And it is useless to deplore today the reactions of which you are well aware, since the error has been committed by the IOC in an anti-legal provision.²⁰²

Brundage was aggravated at this diversity of contradictory opinions. He confided to Killanin: "Despite the discussion at our last meeting, the practice of venting personal opinion, not to mention adverse criticism of the Committee, has continued.

In an important matter of this kind, this verges on treason and I think it has come to the point where it should be punished.”²⁰³ Member organizations should at least withhold public statements, even if they disagreed with decisions taken by the IOC. “If they feel so strongly, they can always resign.”²⁰⁴

The internal loyalties of the IOC and Olympic Movement were being sorely tested. In the face of the tidal wave of correspondence reaching his desk, Brundage was unable to set the parameters of the public debate and narrative.

It was becoming increasingly clear that the issue was not going to be fully resolved before the Executive Board met in Lausanne to discuss options, but a resolution of the issue would not be easy, as Brundage pointed out to Andrianov: “I am sure every member of the Committee stands firmly against discrimination of any kind in sport. Some think, however, that because of its political policies, South Africa must be completely ostracized, while others believe that the admission of a multi-racial team to the Game[s] will be more effective in correcting the existing condition. I hope we can find a satisfactory solution in our meeting in Lausanne next week.”²⁰⁵ To effect such a solution, Alexander advised Brundage to take firm control and contain the issue,

... you alone must make the decision. You have nothing to lose and everything to gain.... under Clause 18 the President must rule that the power to convene a meeting relates only to new questions. There is nothing new about the South African question; it has always been known that several countries would threaten boycott if South Africa is included.... Here again the President must rule that the organisers have flagrantly and willfully violated the IOC rules, and if they do not immediately cease to meddle with the South African question their authority to hold the Games must be withdrawn. In this case there is new information and new circumstances to consider at an IOC meeting to be convened for the purpose.²⁰⁶

Brundage, as USA IOC member Douglas Roby pointed out, might not now have the power base in the IOC to take control of the situation, but the fact was that a clear majority had voted for readmitting South Africa. "...the final decision was participated in by approximately 66 of our 71 members. Some of the legal minds who are members of the IOC now contend that our procedure was improper and, therefore, the decision, as taken at Grenoble, should be disregarded. I think these questions should have been raised at Grenoble if they were of substance and the fact that all of those who are now complaining did participate in the vote places their stamp of approval on the procedure as taken. I realize that numbers now on the Executive Board are against you, but I hope that you and the few that you have with you will continue on the course which was charted at Grenoble."²⁰⁷

After two days of discussion in Lausanne, the Executive Board settled on a recommendation "... to withdraw the invitation which the South African [National] Olympic Committee has received to participate in the Games of the XIX Olympiad."²⁰⁸

Brundage provided the official rationale:

It should be emphasized that in adopting this recommendation the International Olympic Committee is not bowing to threats or pressures of any kind from those who do not understand the true Olympic philosophy. Boycott is not a word used in sport circles.... The Executive Board was facing a deep and worldwide cleavage in public opinion that threatened to split the Olympic family and to endanger the success of the Games of the XIX Olympiad. It was necessary to reach a decision, and if possible a unanimous decision immediately.... The only point in the lengthy discussions on which none of the members of the Executive Board could agree, was, that because of the explosive conditions throughout the world and the ugly demonstrations, rioting, and other violent happenings in many different countries during the last sixty days, there was actual danger if a South African team appeared at the Games.... You will find in the carefully worded cablegram, which was sent to all members of

the International Olympic Committee, after two solid days of heated but earnest discussions, that there is no criticism of Mexico, no criticism of South Africa and no criticism of the International Olympic Committee. There were no suspensions nor expulsions nor were there any legal technicalities mentioned. Such procedures are foreign to the sport world, which is based on fair play and good sportsmanship, but in its endeavour to preserve the Olympic Movement, one of the most priceless and powerful instruments of our present civilization, it was necessary to be realistic; facts right or wrong must be faced.... Since our primary concern is the assembly of the youth of all the 135 countries now active in the Olympic Movement, in friendly and peaceful competition, we regret deeply the consequences for the individual participants who had hoped to take part in this Grand Festival of Youth in Mexico City. It is a sad commentary on the state of the world today.... All of the ballots have not yet been received, so the voting is not finished. There will be another statement tomorrow.²⁰⁹

When the results of the vote were finalized, Brundage distributed a circular letter recounting the history of the South African issue since the Grenoble meeting, emphasizing the importance of the concessions the IOC had been able to extract from the South African government, but these were necessarily limited to the Olympic Games only. "If nations are to be excluded because of repression or discrimination of one kind or another within their borders either by law or by practice," he noted, "there will be few if any countries in the Olympic Games. Large and small, practically every country in the world is guilty in some respects."²¹⁰ Nonetheless, the Grenoble decision had immediately provoked a campaign which saw the Olympic Games "unexpectedly precipitated into the middle of a world-wide, racial controversy, which has torn the world apart," and ultimately threatened the very success of the Mexico Olympiad. Only these dire circumstances had induced him to call a Special Meeting of the Executive Board. After protracted discussions "at last it was determined that all members seemed to agree, although for different reasons, that it would be unwise, for

its own sake, as well as for the sake of the Olympic Movement, for a South African team to appear in Mexico City next October.” Brundage emphasized that this decision did not indicate that the IOC had bowed to political pressure; rather, the decision had been taken to put an end to the general disorder and violence the issue had given rise to in many countries. “Had the recommendation not been adopted, the Games of the XIX Olympiad would undoubtedly have been ruined, if not canceled, and the Olympic Movement would have received a blow from which it would take years to recover.”²¹¹

Naturally, this did not please everyone. Australian member Weir, for one, was upset at the result: “I cannot help feeling that the IOC and the Olympic Movement throughout the world has been seriously harmed and our prestige very seriously damaged. Unquestionable, the Black races and those who supported them in their threatened boycott are regarding the decision as a great victory.”²¹² Surely, he thought this was Brundage’s most embarrassing and disheartening moment as President.²¹³ Brundage agreed with him.²¹⁴

It was now difficult to determine the strength, trustworthiness, and legitimacy of the IOC and South Africa’s future in the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement. Though Killanin believed the right decision had eventually been made, he told Brundage the IOC was in for more trouble in the near future: “We are living in a very different era to that in which Baron de Coubertin constituted the Olympic Games and I think it would be stupid for us to bury our head in the sand. I am certain we have taken the right decision in the end regarding South Africa but it was unfortunate we had to yield certain principles. In point of fact it could be argued that South Africa has been kept out by us for political reasons!”²¹⁵ What was necessary, he argued, in view

of “no doubt ... a good deal of trouble from Africa during the next eight to twelve years,” was for the IOC to secure its future position in Africa by making “contacts regarding suitable people for the IOC.”²¹⁶

Brundage agreed; the IOC needed serious review to prepare for and to anticipate what lay ahead: “We must be prepared. We saved the Games of the 19th Olympiad and prevented a complete rupture of international sport, although we were thrown into the middle of this terrible international racial controversy, the last place we should be. It was really a victory although we have to admit that is not the public impression.”²¹⁷

5. Domestic Resistance

Coincidentally, and similar to the case of SANOC correspondence, there was a large gap in the communication between Avery Brundage and the foremost organization of domestic resistance in South Africa. Over a year’s time had passed after the 1964 Tokyo Olympics before SAN-ROC representative John Rogers contacted Brundage from London, reviewing the history of the IOC’s treatment of the South African issue: “I am requested to strongly demand the unequivocal expulsion of the South Africa Olympic Committee from the Olympic Movement under Rule 25 of the Olympic Charter and regulations.”²¹⁸ The domestic resistance was not satisfied solely with the withdrawal of the invitation to SANOC for the 1964 Tokyo Games. According to Rogers, SANOC’s continued violation of Olympic rules and regulations merited expulsion from the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement.

Some nine months after Roger's letter, one of the founding members of SAN-ROC, Chris de Broglio, pointed out to Brundage the recurring discrimination in South Africa. South Africa's suspension from the Olympic Games had not impeded the opportunity for international competition for white athletes who, like the South African Amateur Athletic Union, simply sought expanded opportunities for participation at World Championships. "In this way their white athletes will take part even more frequently in International Competitions whilst the Coloured South Africans are simply deprived of any form of international competition.... We also wish to point out to you that two South African Coloured sportsmen who were forced to leave their country because of the colour bar in sport have recently been selected to represent Great Britain ... The great shame is that many others are being deprived of their right of participation in international sport because of their colour."²¹⁹ Such examples of racial discrimination in South African sport, according to SAN-ROC, did not bode well for the re-admittance of South Africa to the Olympic Games.

Four months later, in November 1966, SAN-ROC President Dennis Brutus contacted Brundage. When Brutus heard that the IOC was planning a fact-finding committee to be sent to South Africa to report on the state of Olympic sport, he saw it as a chance to improve relationships with the IOC: "...we would like to submit information to the Investigating Commission.... Please be good enough to inform us whether we can send information either written or oral or both and if we can arrange for representatives of the non-racial sporting bodies to submit evidence to the Commission.... We welcome the decision of the IOC to see the facts for [themselves]

and believe that this will do much to bring South African sport into conformity with the requirements of the Olympic Movement.”²²⁰

As cooperative and as positive as this letter seemed, Brutus may have been acting in opposition to SANOC as much from a desire to establish better relationships with the IOC.²²¹ In any case, subsequent letters from Brutus portrayed SAN-ROC as accommodating and helpful – assisting in any way to improve the South African sport situation by combating racial discrimination. Brutus reminded Brundage that SAN-ROC, in doing so, fully supported IOC rules and regulations, and wished to submit evidence to the Commission: “We believe that the bodies which wish to participate in international sport should state this frankly to show that they are opposed to racial discrimination in sport. They must make it clear that they wish to have events and trials and selection open to all regardless of race or colour. It is our belief that the IOC should grant recognition and participation to all who make this declaration.”²²² Westerhoff responded for the IOC several days later; he requested detailed information on the state of Olympic sport in South Africa, administrative procedures, the state of sports facilities, and detailed information on the role of the South African government, and sports-related legislation.²²³ Westerhoff also sent a similar list to SANOC.

Soon, however, the issue of SAN-ROC’s illicit use of the word mark ‘Olympic,’ began to affect the exchanges adversely.²²⁴ The IOC had warned SAN-ROC about the unauthorized use of ‘Olympic’ before,²²⁵ and SAN-ROC had pledged to stop using it.²²⁶ Further, a month earlier, Alexander had provided some friendly advice to Chris de Broglio, “... it is improper to use the word ‘Olympic’ in sport without the approval of

the International Olympic Committee and continued disregard by you of this point will only arouse reactions which you can well afford to avoid.”²²⁷

After this incident, Brutus attempted to keep in touch with Brundage more regularly, even by arranging to meet in the United States when Brutus was visiting. He wanted “... to discuss with you some aspects of the organisation of sport in South Africa, with special reference to the observance of the Olympic rules.”²²⁸ Two months later, knowing that South African participation in the 1968 Mexico City Games was a topic of discussion at the IOC Tehran meetings, Brutus wrote Brundage. On SAN-ROC’s behalf, he highlighted six points:

1. We believe that the IOC must provide for all amateur sportsmen and all countries in the world who fall within the Olympic code;
2. We believe that the IOC correctly excluded South Africa from participation in the 1964 Tokyo Olympics and that South Africa should only be granted participation as soon as they make it clear that they do not have racial discrimination in sport but provide fairly and equally for all sportsmen;
3. The present changes in the sports arrangements in South Africa are only APPARENT: they DO NOT REMOVE RACIAL DISCRIMINATION. This is freely admitted by the Prime Minister, the sports administrators and the Press in South Africa;
4. We believe that these facts can easily be established by the IOC Commission which is to visit South Africa and report; the investigations to be conducted by the world bodies for Weightlifting and Gymnastics will also prove this;
5. We believe that the IOC should insist on the full observance of the Olympic rules by the governing sports bodies in South Africa; if there is government interference then this will disqualify them;
6. We call on the International Olympic Committee and all national Olympic Committees to stand firm on these principles.²²⁹

Brutus also gave assurance that SAN-ROC had the desire to see Olympic principles rightfully applied in South African sport, and that it would be willing to work towards achieving the Olympic ideals. Such declarations were the right things to say to display SAN-ROC's commitment to improve South African sport. After the IOC Tehran meetings, de Broglio released a detailed summary of events at the meetings, from SAN-ROC's perspective.²³⁰ He was cautiously optimistic, but noted that SANOC had not fully complied with Olympic rules. Further, there was growing opposition to South Africa's participation: "The African delegates were unanimous in declaring their support for the resolution adopted in Bamako, which *inter alia* asked all African countries to reserve their decision to participate in the 1968 Olympics should a South African team be invited whilst racial segregation and discrimination is enforced in South African sport."²³¹ For the first time, SAN-ROC publicly stated that, "... [it did] not have the ambition of controlling South African sport. If a genuine merger of all existing organisations did take place with complete equality, SANROC would have no more reason to exist."²³² All in all, de Broglio hoped SANOC left the meeting with a sense that work still needed to be done: "It [was] becoming very clear that apartheid in sport will no longer be tolerated by the large majority of members making up the Olympic Movement."²³³

When the SAC report finally became public six months later, Brutus laid out SAN-ROC's perspective on the report. He noted that the document demonstrated the persistence of racism in South African sports, and a lack of willingness on SANOC's part to effect any changes. A high degree of government interference likewise served to reproduce the racialized set-up of South African sports, even though the

“overwhelming majority of South African sportsmen – and this is the standpoint SAN-ROC represents – fe[lt] abhorrence for segregation in sport.”²³⁴

To complement his public statement, Brutus elaborated on his concerns in a letter to Brundage: “We note with some alarm the indications in the Report that the Commission seemed to think that the fact that some South Africans – white or non-white, but in any case a minority of the sportsmen – favours racial discrimination in sport was sufficient grounds for the IOC to approve a violation of its fundamental principles.”²³⁵ SAN-ROC, in any case, refuted the insinuation that the organization was “not supported by the non-racial sports bodies in South Africa.... I wish to renew the request that SAN-ROC, as an interested body, should be heard when the views of other bodies are sought.”²³⁶

Long-time SAN-ROC member Reg Hlongwane, sent a cablegram to Brundage pointing out some possible considerations when interpreting SAC’s report: “Evidence given by most Coloured and Indian sportsmen in South Africa does not reflect the true desire of these sportsmen. It must be appreciated that the political situation there makes protests against apartheid intolerable to the present government and this subjects opponents to police surveillance and intimidation.”²³⁷

Brutus’ and Hlongwane’s interventions notwithstanding, the IOC, as was pointed out above, sanctioned SANOC’s participation in the 1968 Mexico City Games. Brutus was dismayed at the decision “... to invite the South African Racial Olympic Committee to the Mexico City Games.”²³⁸ This decision could only threaten the continued existence of the IOC and the Olympic Movement. The Resolution further required that the South African team

... must be one which 'conforms with Fundamental Principle 1' and 'on the understanding that it continues vigorously its efforts to have ALL forms of racial discrimination in amateur sport removed.' The South African spokesmen have made it clear that they will NOT work to have all forms of racial discrimination in amateur sport removed; I ask that they give a firm assurance that they will do this.... we deeply regret that the IOC has been willing to betray its own high principles in full knowledge of the vicious racist policies which dominate sport in South Africa; all who truly care for fair play and justice in sport must continue to oppose racial discrimination in sport.²³⁹

In a letter to Lord Killanin, de Broglio argued that much damage had been done to the IOC by an impression created in the report that "an overwhelming majority of non-white officials and sportsmen favoured a return to the Olympics under the prevailing conditions inside S.A. The report gave the further impression that this aspect was of crucial importance in deciding the issue.... I contend that this argument is invalid as a basis for the readmission of a National Olympic Committee which practices and has always practised racial discrimination at all levels of its organization."²⁴⁰ And even if a majority of officials interviewed by the Commission had come out in favour of the status quo, "I doubt very much that these officials represented a majority of sportsmen ...To be fair the report should have made it clear that a number of non-white officials with large memberships insisted on the principle of Mixed Trials. This can be clearly seen from numerous press reports during the visit of your commission.... This omission from the report is a very serious one as this was the deciding factor in favour of the racist organisation."²⁴¹ Ultimately, he concluded, even these points were of minor significance as long as the IOC failed to extract from SANOC "solid guarantee to eliminate all forms of discrimination within the next two or three years."²⁴²

Killanin rejected de Broglio's charge that the Commission had rested its conclusions on a skewed and tendentious sampling of interviewees. "I might say we took considerable care to find out those people who spoke to us, who they represented and, where possible, the numbers of affiliations, clubs, etc. Had the views which you now express been correct I feel they would have been put by those people who opposed the re-entry of South Africa during the debate in the IOC."²⁴³

The last SAN-ROC missive before the 1968 Mexico City Games came from Brutus, just before the special Executive Board meeting described above. He wished to impress on the board members the importance of entertaining the "view of the non-racial sportsmen and sports bodies which support the Olympic principles in South Africa," largely to counter "the dishonesty of the South African National Olympic Committee in agreeing to accept terms laid down by the IOC when they have made it clear elsewhere that they have neither the desire nor the capacity to comply with these terms. Any agreement by them to 'continue to work for the removal of all racial discrimination in amateur sport' is made meaningless by their declaration that they cannot foresee integrated sport in the foreseeable future and that they fully support the racial discrimination enjoined by government policies."²⁴⁴ The reasons for withdrawing the invitation to South Africa, Brutus concluded, just were still valid.

The lack of correspondence from domestic resistance forces subsequent to the Executive Board's decision leading to a majority vote by IOC members to withdraw the invitation to South Africa for the 1968 Mexico City Games, can be viewed as an indication of the fact that the resistance and SAN-ROC had achieved its immediate objective. Between 1964 and 1968, the activities of SAN-ROC and the South African

Sports Association appeared less energetic than in previous years. The domestic resistance message owed much appreciation to the IOC and NOC members who opposed South Africa's re-admittance to the 1968 Games, and to the vociferous international community who made sure that its voice disapproving of South Africa's involvement in the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement was heard.

6. The International Community

The period between the 1964 Tokyo Games and 1968 Mexico City Games produced more correspondence from the international community than any other period examined. Over 100 letters from the general public within the South African folders of the Avery Brundage Collection can be noted.²⁴⁵ Unlike the two earlier time periods under investigation here, the correspondence was not significantly weighted in favour of either suspending or expelling South Africa from the Olympic Games. The highly publicized readmission South Africa and the subsequent repeal of that decision, stirred feelings that produced both supportive and oppositional arguments concerning the inclusion of South Africa in the Games.

Congratulatory letters were still being received by Brundage and the IOC after the 1964 Tokyo Games. For example, P.B. Woolley of Australia pronounced: "I am writing ... to applaud the Olympic Federation on its action in banning South Africa from the Tokyo Olympic Games. If this were done by all sporting bodies, then the struggle for racial tolerance would be greatly furthered, and as the only sporting body to take such action, we feel that the Olympic Federation should be especially commended."²⁴⁶ Nonetheless, the letters pertinent to the re-admittance of South Africa to the 1968

Mexico City Games began to appear a year and a half after the Tokyo Games. Jackie Robinson, residing in Albany, New York, threatened to work towards a boycott, should the initial decision to bar South Africa be rescinded: "I must alert you, that if there are any changes in this decision we will do everything within our power to have all Civil Rights organizations urge Negroes to withdraw from any competition as far as the Olympic Games are concerned.... America cannot in 1967 condone the racist policies of South Africa. ... We hope that unless there is a change in the South African policy, the United States delegation will fight vigorously any changes from its present position."²⁴⁷

This letter was straightforward – keep South Africa out or the IOC will risk a boycott. Letters advocating a boycott of the Mexico City Games provided an ongoing thread at this stage of the debate.

On the other hand, some letters supporting the re-admittance of South Africa had severe racist and political undertones; however, they sometimes reflected on the internal condition of the letter writer's own country, rather than those prevailing in South Africa: "Thank you very much for this, that is, the guts to speak up. I'm so fed up hearing about and seeing the negro I could throw up. This America of ours reflects so little of its basic culture anymore that I'm beginning to think I'm the minority. I'd just love to see an all-white team represent the USA and let the negro go to hell."²⁴⁸

Brundage did not need support based in its own form of racism. Letters from people such as noted Olympic competitor Ralph Boston, in response to one of Brundage's public statements, struck a rational yet exceedingly critical tone: "As an Olympic competitor, I am strongly against [the] use of the Olympic Games for anything

other than the reason for which they were organized. I am sure that you are aware of the fact that sports has helped the cause of the Negro's [sic] more than any other single thing and that chances for a boycott are practically nil. The people who are saying such things are not appointed leaders and have no reason to attempt to speak for Negroes as a whole. In short they are 'out of order'."249

Frequently, Brundage sought to correct what he considered erroneous information in the public debate. Usually, he reiterated the IOC's basic position that the organization did not condone racial discrimination in sports and insisted on the separation of sport and politics. The task of the Commission investigating the South African situation was to determine just those conditions in the country, as Brundage explained to Tom Jacobson: "The fundamental basis of the Olympic Movement is no discrimination because of race, color, religion or political affiliations. Apartheid is a political policy of the South African government and we do not deal with governments. ... We have sent a committee to investigate and there will be a report at the next meeting of the International Olympic Committee in Grenoble next February."250

The amount of correspondence directed to Brundage spiked following the IOC South Africa Commission visit to South Africa. M.O. Whitsel Sr. of Louisiana argued that action deriving from the Commission would only serve to harm the athletes: "I read an article, in which so called big leaders, are talking [about] boycotts by American negroes to the International meets.... It is them (big leaders) who are hurting the negro athletes. These men who are great in sports have worked hard to

get where they are. Now some big so-called leaders are hurting these men and women who have worked hard to get to the top.”²⁵¹

Ralph Davis, a lawyer from Chicago, USA, expressed a similar opinion: “After hearing the proposals [of the American Negro athletes], I commented that they were ‘shooting’ at the wrong persons. In my opinion you had always been the ‘Champion’ of the rights of the amateur and minority groups.”²⁵² The reception of principally supportive letters was balanced against those with a negative connotation, as, for example, a note from John Laird of California: “Just let those negroes go to – do not even try to pacify them; we can get along without them and they will be the losers so just sit tight and leave them alone.... Of course they won’t want to stay home since they like to be seen on TV so much.... If the TV station would stop showing them waving their arms telling their crowds what to do, most of the rioting would stop.”²⁵³ Vera Herbstman, by contrast, encouraged Brundage to join the Black American boycott of the Olympic Games.²⁵⁴ D.K. Miller passed on support from people on Capitol Hill, commending the position Brundage had taken.²⁵⁵ Ardis Bryant sent Brundage a six-page booklet discussing how the boycott would negatively affect black athletes.²⁵⁶

Of far greater weight was the letter Brundage received from Douglas Roby, President of the United States Olympic Committee²⁵⁷ and IOC member. Roby expressed himself skeptical of South Africa’s aims:

I am writing to express my concern about the possibility of South Africa’s readmission to the Olympic Games, despite her continued policy of ‘separation’, that is, apartheid, in sports. If the Olympic Committee seriously respects the Olympic Charter it cannot possibly allow South Africa to participate, since it is obvious that Vorster’s new sports policy is merely a new face for the same old situation of discrimination. South Africa, by enforcing separation of the races in

sports up to actual participation in the Games, is obviously going against the Charter.... apartheid is necessarily a political matter, and its intrusion into sports matters is grounds for the continued expulsion of South Africa from the Olympic Games. I therefore urge the International Olympic Committee, at its meeting at the end of the month in Grenoble, to decide not to allow South Africa back into the Olympics. This will be one of the strongest ways in which the world can express its abhorrence of South Africa's racial policies, and it is an opportunity which must not be missed.²⁵⁸

This was the first letter specifically referring to the upcoming IOC Grenoble meeting where a decision to readmit South Africa was to be made. Advice for Brundage relative to the Grenoble meetings continued to come in. Joseph and Carol Schwab of New York basically mirrored Roby's argument: "We are not fooled—and trust that you are not fooled either—by South Africa's promise to send a racially mixed team to the Olympics; obviously, black athletes do not have an opportunity equal to that of whites to qualify for a South African team.... We hope that as you consider your position on this matter you will think of the human degradation that is committed under apartheid in South Africa."²⁵⁹

SAN-ROC's attempts to mobilize international opinion was also increasingly reflected in the correspondence. For example, Margaret Flory of New York based her opinion on information circulated by SAN-ROC: "Mr. Dennis Brutus, President of South Africa's Non-Racial Olympic Committee has himself stated that South Africa's 'New Sports Policy' has so far been nothing more than a propaganda tool and has not in any way affected the racial structure of South African sports. Therefore[,] South Africa's policies of racial discrimination in sports continue unchecked. ...We feel that the IOC must not allow South Africa in the Olympic competition until she does in fact learn to accept the principles of racial equality...."²⁶⁰

Rudolph Balsiger, who had published an extensive and one-sided report in 1963, distributed a long letter to IOC members. He reiterated many of the arguments made in the report mentioned in an earlier chapter. He insisted on racial separation, arguing that the guidance of whites through a policy of separate development had contributed much to the development of the non-white population of South Africa, compared to other African countries. SAN-ROC, in contrast to the ostensibly benevolent white organization, was “an illegal, political Committee which tries to win the allegiance of Non-White sport organizations and render them subservient to their political designs.”²⁶¹ And Dennis Brutus, he argued, certainly could not be trusted: After all, it must have been Brutus himself who, on the occasion of a meeting organized in 1963 by SANOC and attended by both Balsiger and the then banned Brutus, through “self-denunciation” had seen to it that South African police appeared on the scene, in order “to show me, a foreigner, what a police state South Africa was.”²⁶² When Brutus was later shot by South African police, John Harris took over for SAN-ROC whose statements, Balsiger insisted, “showed more and more his true attitude which, in my opinion, had nothing to do with sport, but uncovered the Communist agent more and more.”²⁶³ Ultimately, Balsiger warned the IOC not to overestimate its influence on South African racial politics, and focus on the sports situation within the context of that racial policy: “The racial legislation in South Africa would never be changed by or because of sport, in the same way as no other Government, whether of the East, West or Africa, would change her laws as a result of the wishes of the IOC. And there are many things in many countries which could be rendered more worthy of human

beings.... A boycott of South Africa by the IOC would direct itself in the first instance and with all its force against the Non-White sportsmen of this country.”²⁶⁴

By contrast, contributors such as Robert Maurer, Mathew Ahmann, or Arne Sovik,²⁶⁵ based their opposition to the racial policies of South Africa on human rights and the unity of the human race. Until South Africa provided social change and racial integration, they urged the IOC to deny South Africa’s participation in the 1968 Mexico City Games. Nor would have Balsiger convinced Leon Shull, J. Murray MacInnes, Tim Smith, or Edwin Luidens,²⁶⁶ all of whom individually addressed the inauthenticity of South Africa’s “New Sports Policy.” Shull, for example, noted that “... further examination reveal[ed] that the team’s membership still [was] chosen through racially segregated trial competition. Separate racial competition and inferior facilities for non-white athletes repudiates the essence of free, unrestrained competition mandatory for national representation...”²⁶⁷ Shull therefore urged the IOC “not to accept the ‘New Sports Policy’ that would allow South African participation in the 1968 Olympics.”²⁶⁸ Bruce A. Cronnell, similarly, appealed to the necessity of not supporting racism,²⁶⁹ while others, such as Vel Phillips and Bettie Mae Eisendrath,²⁷⁰ as well as Elizabeth Landis,²⁷¹ based their arguments on the *Olympic Charter* and South African law. Landis pointed out that, the new sport policy notwithstanding “the South African government prevents compliance with the Olympic Charter, in particular Principle 1 and Clause 25.... The fact that South Africa may be represented by a team which includes non-white athletes, chosen, after separate competitions for members of each racial group, by a multi-racial committee on which whites have a

built-in dominant position, does not change the fundamentally discriminatory nature of all sports in South Africa....”²⁷²

Some of the correspondents argued for the exclusion of South Africa from the basis of personal experiences in the country, among them James Dorothy and Tina Bristol of Philadelphia: “As a result of two years of experience in Southern Africa, we are deeply aware of the racial injustice daily, doing violence [to] millions [of] non-white Africans. International condemnation of apartheid is necessary. South Africa’s new sports policy is hypocritical, leaving unaltered racially segregated trial competitions for selection of the Olympic team.”²⁷³

Though the majority of early correspondence on the matter was from the USA, letters from other parts of the world also continued to reach the IOC. Lars Borge-Andersen wrote on behalf of the Norwegian Council for Southern Africa which “fully support[ed] the demand for continued exclusion of South Africa from the Olympic Games, as long as coloured sportsmen are not allowed to compete freely with white...., [we] request Olympic sportsmen to condemn sports racism in South Africa and to insist on the decision of 1963 not to permit South Africa to take part in the Olympics until there has been ‘a change of policy regarding colour discrimination in sports and competitions in its county’.”²⁷⁴

Palmer Van Gundy, who wanted Brundage to use his influence and power to keep South Africa out of the Games, was another who offered that line of reasoning.²⁷⁵ George Houser of the American Committee on Africa (ACA), similarly wrote to Westerhoff to complain: “The IOC’s decision to readmit South Africa to the Olympics has destroyed the integrity of the Games. South Africa’s policy does not change

apartheid in sports in South African and still defies Olympic rules. Reaction in much of the world will confirm the fact that the IOC accepts racism.”²⁷⁶

Houser’s intervention drew a lengthy reply from Geoffrey Picard, a bronze medalist at the 1964 Tokyo Games. He objected to ACA’s call for a boycott since the racial segregation it targeted, was by no means limited to South Africa, but rather “appear[ed] indicative of ‘fuzzy thinking’,” inasmuch as such segregation was not unique to a single country. “I suspect,” he averred,

that either directly or indirectly the Hindus’ discrimination against Moslems and other Hindus, the Moslems’ discrimination against Hindus, the discrimination against Chinese in Malaysia and Indonesia is reflected in the composition of the Olympic teams of India, Pakistan, Malaysia, and Indonesia respectively. Obviously we can go further: Should not the anti-Asian policy of Kenya be considered? And, if so, what about the U.K.? We have not even mentioned the U.S.A. ... Were your [ACA’s] protest one against discrimination in general, it would be far more effective. Indeed, in this case, the protest could be focused on South African apartheid as a concrete symbol of a much larger problem. Lacking emphasis on these broader implications significantly weakens the proposal....²⁷⁷

Picard concluded his argument against a boycott by pointing out that it would only lead to the denial of important opportunities to participate in high-level competitions to “blacks, whites, and Asian, however selected.”²⁷⁸

The international correspondence remained strong as evidenced by missives from The National Executive Board and Pan African Students’ Organization in the Americas,²⁷⁹ Leonard West, on behalf of the Africa Cultural Centre,²⁸⁰ and David H. Rubenstein, the Associate Secretary for Africa for The United Church Board for World Ministries. He argued that the IOC’s admittance of South Africa amounted to a contravention of Articles 1 and 25 of the *Olympic Charter*; he “urge[d] that the

International Olympic Committee reconsider its decision concerning South Africa's participation under its present declared policy, and thus make it unnecessary for the Supreme Council of Sports for Africa and other nations of the world to boycott the Olympic Games in 1968."²⁸¹

Nonetheless, there were those who, for various reasons, supported South Africa's re-admittance. Henry Cathles, writing to Brundage, deplored that "... the tendency of communist and new African states not educated in the enlightened classical purpose of the Olympic Games as originally established in Greece, is to use them for political boycott, spreading hate and unrest.... Of course one cannot help wondering if we are not better off without the barbarian communists, etc. in the games at all!"²⁸² Nancy Lee Hanson, expressed her support of South Africa's re-admittance, inasmuch as it had "taken the first amazing step forward by agreeing to an integrated team. This surely will be followed by other steps – certainly if the negro athletes do themselves proud and win some medals or shatter some records. Think what that would do for Black morale in South Africa.... I think you are doing a wonderful job toward better world relations. Keep it up."²⁸³ T.R. Kendrick III of Georgia, offered similar words of encouragement: "I believe that the Union of South Africa by being willing to liberalize its apartheid philosophy and enter a completely integrated team is a mammoth step forward for that nation and is a 'big feather in the cap' of international athletics. This is the first indication of liberalization of the apartheid philosophy that even economic and political embargoes have been unable to change. I believe it would be a very big mistake for the International Olympic Committee to give in to a threat of boycott by several minor fourth and fifth class nations...."²⁸⁴

Often enough, however, letters in favour of South African reinstatement carried racist undertones. Forbes Norris, for example, declared himself “...sick and tired of reading about these ‘unhappy black racists.’ Now they want to dictate how the Olympics should be run.... I hope you and the Board will stick to your guns and let South Africa compete. If the blacks don’t like it, fine. I’d rather we lost without them than win with them. I wish they’d all get out.... don’t let the blacks ruin it.”²⁸⁵

While Brundage received letters expressing concern about the effects of such decisions on various countries,²⁸⁶ most focussed strictly on the IOC and South Africa. Sir Arnold Lunn broke down the situation to two choices for the IOC. When one explored them, certain contradictions surfaced:

The Olympic Committee could adopt one of two logical policies with regard to countries in which men are persecuted or discriminated against for religious, political or racial reasons. The Committee could exclude from the Games all teams representing countries in which there is such persecution, and this I believe might lead to a real diminution of persecution, or the Committee could admit all teams, irrespective of the domestic policies of the countries entering them, but in a century in which there has been more persecution than in any previous century, to signal out one country, South Africa, for excommunication, is a classic example of selective indignation.... As the IOC officially disapproved of apartheid as practised by South Africa, why did the Committee ignore apartheid as practised by Germany and Russia? ... I am not criticising the Olympic Committee for admitting Russia to the Games ... but the inconsistency in applying what you profess to be the Olympic Committee’s principles. ‘Apartheid, Nazism and Communism ...’ you write, ‘are political doctrines, and we have enough troubles in sport without venturing into politics.’ But you did venture into politics when you excommunicated South Africa for its apartheid politics. The form of anti-Semitic apartheid practised by Nazi Germany was infinitely, I repeat, infinitely, more objectionable than that practised by South Africa, and if you had withdrawn the Olympic Games from Germany when it became impossible to deny that thousands of Jews were being persecuted, the blow to Hitler’s prestige might have been incalculable.²⁸⁷

The IOC did indeed begin to understand that its decisions concerning forms of political discrimination that had affected earlier Olympic Games, were exerting a significant influence on its options to reach a decision on the South African case. Indeed, one effect of this international debate was that the issue of discrimination and its connection to political intervention was discussed prominently.

Brundage even received resolutions that were more closely linked to political decision making bodies, such as the Japanese Diet Member Sports Promotion Federation: "Though we believe the world of sports should not be influenced by politics or ideologies, the current controversy involving re-entry of South Africa in the Olympic games comes from the people[']s innate idea[s] demanding non-discrimination of races and equal treatment for them, and we strongly request that the IOC should take proper steps, in the light of the spirit of the Charter of Olympics, to open conversation urgently with the representatives of African nations so as to prevent the so-called Five-Rings Rally being reduced to a Four-Rings one."²⁸⁸ This missive made it clear that the political connotations of the situation could not be avoided.

This resolution focused on involving every African country in the discussion because of the politics involved. It seemed that political repercussions were unavoidable according to the Rt. Rev. C. Edward Crowther's personal experience:

Having been deported by the South African government in June last year because of the stand I was obliged to take in the light of the tremendous suffering of my people, I believe that I can speak with reasonable knowledge of the situation.... I know how politically useful to the government of South Africa the decision of the Olympic Committee will be. I am perfectly aware of the argument that politics has no place in sport. I only wish that were so. In South Africa, sport

is politics. The triumph of Mr. Vorster in furthering the belief of the whites of South Africa that the world will learn to accept apartheid is a terrible blow to the many non-white people and those South African whites who look to the outside world for hope and support.... It is in the hope that sport can be preserved from politics that I urge you to seek reconsideration of South Africa's participation in the Olympic Games.²⁸⁹

Brundage was not willing to accept the possibility that sports and politics could be so inextricably intertwined. "The International Olympic Committee does not deal with governments nor with political policies," he informed SAN-ROC representative John Rogers, "[e]very member of the Committee is firmly opposed to discrimination of any kind in sport. South Africa has not been admitted to the Olympic Games, we are inviting a multi-racial team selected by a multi-racial committee in accordance with the Olympic regulations."²⁹⁰

Brundage appreciated those, who like him, clearly separated SANOC from South African politics. When he agreed with people, such as correspondents Nancy Lee Hanson, T.R. Kendrick III, and Martin Pape,²⁹¹ he wrote letters thanking them for their support. However, Brundage did not expect all feedback to be positive and he well realized that some of the IOC's conflicts were necessary. He pointed out to correspondent Henry Cathles: "It seems to be a continuous battle to keep the Olympic Movement free from politics and commercialism. In this last squabble they seem to overlook the fact that the IOC is the only organization that has ever done something for the underprivileged non-whites of South Africa."²⁹²

Regardless of the good Brundage thought the IOC was able to accomplish, statements of personal support and criticism, of morals or political reasoning, continued to arrive, many in support of South Africa's exclusion from the 1968 Mexico

City Games. A Canadian labour union, misunderstanding IOC administrative procedures, even requested that the Canadian federal government, through the Canadian Olympic Committee, involve itself directly and “demand an extraordinary meeting of the 71-member International Olympic Committee to reverse its earlier decision to readmit South Africa for participation in the Summer Olympics, to be held in Mexico City in October of this year.... Failing such reversal by the IOC, this Union requests the Canadian Government that it advise the Canadian Olympic Committee to withdraw from the Summer Olympics.”²⁹³

Such a suggestion to mix sports with political processes was sure to raise the IOC's, and Brundage's, ire. To the latter's credit, he was consistent in his convictions and did not waver in his message, which he continually repeated in his correspondence. To correspondents such as Hugh McGee, Carl Bauer, James Wilson, James Lee, Joseph Pratt, Ira Nadler, or Edwin Mosler,²⁹⁴ Brundage offered the same unchanging position: The issue was whether politicians or sportsmen controlled the Olympic Games. Correspondent Alejandro Sanchez Robles of Mexico offered insight from the perspective of just such a sportsman: “...if the majority is against the participation of South Africa, it is because it does not take the trouble to consider that athletes cannot be held responsible for the political attitude of their governments. The fact that South Africa has agreed to send a multi-racial team to Mexico indicates that she is prepared to respect the Olympic Ideal.... The Olympic Games are not competitions between nations but between individuals, and claims from countries which refuse to understand this are not worth further attention.”²⁹⁵ Edwin Mosler likewise

emphatically expressed his support for Brundage's insistence on the separation of sports from politics:

We have a right to expect that the Olympic Committee will not interfere in internal politics, laws, or policy, and that the nations that compete will not use the Olympic Games as a forum to express their political views or advance their ideologies. If South Africa is admitted to the Olympic Games and lives up to the Olympic regulation and ideals, I expect to support those Games and I am willing to work a little harder if that's what it means.... When the IOC allows politics to enter the picture and accedes to the demands of nations who disagree in politics or ideologies, that's when I will lose interest.... I hope your committee will stand by its decision.²⁹⁶

Some correspondents, on the other hand, invoked the notion of a universal morality: "It is within the power of the International Olympic Committee to help prevent the dangerous division between the black and white races of the world. Please express your belief in the equality of all men by [having] representation in the Olympics by the athletes from South Africa."²⁹⁷ Grace Campbell likewise excoriated "South Africa's deplorable and inhumane policy of apartheid [which] simply cannot and must not be tolerated any longer by the freedom loving, just and humane peoples of the world.... We intend to do our utmost to influence all the people we can against visiting the games or Mexico because of this shameful condition."²⁹⁸ To the extent that moral considerations entered the discussion, as this example indicates, they were in the large majority of contributions targeted at a discussion of the race-related issue.

This, in consequence, became the dominant strand of this narrative, leading the majority of correspondents to demand a retraction of the invitation, and to ignore possible side effects such as the foreclosure of opportunities to participate in high-

level competitions. Hideji Kawasaki's letter to Brundage provided a good example of this race-centred aspect of the developing narrative:

... there lies a fundamental question on the participation of South Africa in the Olympic Games since it has been pursuing, as the national policy, strict discrimination between the white and non-white people which go counter to the spirit of Olympics.... The statement made by the South African [National] Olympic Committee on February 28, 1968, seemed to be a step forward to the right direction, and the invitation of the IOC extended to it bas[ed] on the said statement should be said reasonable.... It is reported, however, by some reliable sources that there have been instances in South Africa recently in which whites were given preferential treatment in selection of players in some athletic events and that uni-racial bouts of boxing were held. Viewing from these facts, it must be said that in South Africa there will never be equitable selection which is essential to the Olympic Games.²⁹⁹

This emphatic dimension of the debate was also echoed in a close concern with the stipulations of Article 1 touching on discrimination. Ira E. Gillet of Portland, Oregon, suggested that a clarification of those stipulations would be helpful: "It seems to me the code needs clarification else decision and boycotts will occur because of interpretations which are not warranted by the wording of the code.... 'No discrimination is allowed' by whom? By IOC? Or by the internal regulations of the participating countries in their selection of teams? ... One could scarcely conceive of an IOC being permitted to discriminate on the grounds mentioned."³⁰⁰ Going further, Lynn Moran suggested an even more simplified decision-making framework. South Africa's willingness to nominate white and non-white athletes indicated the country's adherence to the Olympic oath; this would be sufficient to decide the case: "The Olympic oath should be followed, of course, but what a country does outside the Olympics should not ever concern the IOC, which must consider itself strictly separate

from politics or national pressures at all times.”³⁰¹ ACA Director George Houser, on the other hand, denied that such a possibility existed, since racial discrimination in South Africa could not be overcome without political intervention, and sports could not be an exception. The withdrawal of South Africa’s invitation could not be understood as anything other than a political act: “... the resolution passed by the IOC in its re-admittance of South Africa admits that South Africa’s internal sports policy is discriminatory and that the South African National Olympic Committee does not achieve the aims of Fundamental Principle I. Yet, paradoxically, the IOC has decided to still allow South Africa to participate in the Games.... South Africa would have the world think that there has been a change in its internal racial policy of apartheid. There has been no change...”³⁰² Brundage, as may be expected, objected to this perspective, pointing out that the IOC did not “deal with governments nor with political policies [sic]. The South Africa Olympic Committee has agreed to send a multi-racial team, selected by a multiracial committee to the Games of the XIX Olympiad in Mexico City;” this decision remained internal to the relevant sporting organizations.³⁰³

The volume of correspondence increased until mere days before the pivotal 1968 Lausanne Executive Board meeting to discuss the South African issue. Reactions subsequent to the meetings expressed a wide range of opinions, from disappointment to emphatic support for the decision. Some statements commented on the lack of a black voice in the decision-making process: “In all the ‘hue and cry’ over the participation of South Africa in the Olympics, one big observation is that at no time, by no person, have the black athletes themselves been given a choice in the matter! ...

I am sure THEY would argue that for South Africa to enter with integrated teams, represents an important step forward.... I am not a 'white racist'—in fact, my own husband is a Negro—BUT we are both realistic enough to believe that if a man is to preach an end to hypocrisy, he had better NOT be found practicing it himself!"³⁰⁴

Philip Melnick similarly registered his disappointment "to hear of the decision to keep South Africa from participating in this year's Olympics in Mexico! This action will not help but only increase the racial tensions in that country.... Sports should be free from such methods of coercion and intimidation."³⁰⁵ Further, J. Maurice Clark expressed his discontent in a letter to Westerhoff, but acknowledged that Brundage had had to maintain a very finely tuned balance: "Sportsmen everywhere will surely deplore the action of your board in recommending withdrawal of South Africa's invitation to participate in this year's Games.... Apartheid has nothing to do in this connection, because the South Africa team was to have been multi-racial.... I am not racist, and I dislike apartheid. But I also dislike the habit, so prevalent now-a-days, of yielding to every irresponsible and immature outcry by the so-called 'coloured' peoples. Your Board, Sir, has just afforded a prime example of this weak-minded surrender..."³⁰⁶

Many correspondents, P.F.S. Otten of the Netherlands among them, argued by comparison, questioning as unfair treatment the singling-out of South Africa when several examples of similarly problematic conditions could easily be identified: "Really I do not understand the attitude of your International Olympic Committee with respect to South Africa. In the later years I have had the opportunity to visit many countries in Africa and in none of them the position and treatment of the coloured

people (Bantus) is so good as in South Africa.... It is being an unfair and unwise popular attitude always again to criticize South Africa, without having been there and in other countries of Africa and without serious knowledge and a yardstick for comparison.”³⁰⁷ Ernst V. Lotz also criticized the IOC’s strategy as unfair and unbalanced: “To be consistent, the IOC should now also ban the following countries from the Games: Russia, for all the atrocities committed in the name of Communism (the Wall of Shame in Berlin, to name but one); Great Britain and Australia for discrimination against would be non-white immigrants; Israel for her recent war of aggression, etc., etc. Then, when all the devils have been banned,” he continued sardonically, “the angels will have the field all to themselves.”³⁰⁸

This sentiment was echoed by Mr. and Mrs. Haldiman’s letter: “What nation does not discriminate Russia anti-Semitic, Israel anti-Arab, Black African Nations anti-white and on and on. And South Africa had agreed to integrate its team fully.... The next trip we take will be to South Africa, a good friend to America [who] is really feeling discrimination at the hands of our irresponsible ‘leaders’ in Washington and the U.N.”³⁰⁹ Edward Schinman, lastly, criticized the IOC for excluding South Africa while failing to do likewise in the case of “countries as Nigeria, who have boycotted athletes both on the basis of race and religion and you have also welcomed Soviet Russia among whose representatives I am sure you will be hard pressed to find non-communists or Jews. The same applies, for example, to Poland, and how many Asians will you find on the team representing Kenya.... It would appear that the Olympic Committee is now engaging in politics....”³¹⁰

Stuart Morris from Wisconsin, on the other hand, acknowledged that Brundage could not control many aspects of the South African debacle: "As but one man, you could not have prevented the outcry over South Africa's admission to the '68 summer games, but how right it was that she be admitted after agreeing to send an integrated team. Even thus, have politics subverted the Baron's ideals and goals."³¹¹ But had Brundage, after all, lacked the courage of his convictions? "But you could have taken one more courageous step—you could have indicated that South Africa's admission was more important to you than your position as President, or more important than the '68 games themselves, for that matter—you could have resigned in protest!"³¹² Peter Luisa of Queens, New York, was even more scathing in his criticism of the IOC:

I would like to say that it is an outright shame that people even think like you do in a world such as ours. Don't you, and more importantly, the African nations realize that by your actions you have thrown into the ground and completely crushed, the first formidable chance that the Negro has had to prove himself in South AfricaI thought that your actions were a crime. I realize that you were all under tremendous pressure ... but it is totally incomprehensible to me, that you could be true to yourselves in fostering such actions, as banning South Africa again after letting them re-enter the Olympics....³¹³

Rutherford Platt's disappointment at the decision was also based in the understanding usually advocated by the IOC, namely, that only sport-internal factors should be taken into consideration: "I am sure that the young athletes who entered the lists from South Africa, were not in the least involved in making any political decision in their country, whether those decisions are right or wrong in others' opinions. That has nothing to do with your criteria. They must have offered to compete as sportsmen, purely."³¹⁴ Alan Cochet's criticism likewise focussed on the fact that the decision would affect the athletes rather than the political system at the

root of all the problems: "Sir, if you allow political differences to prevent South Africa from participating in the Olympic Games, you are not punishing South Africa, but her athletes and all the athletes of the world.... It was previously a cliché to say that the Olympics generate international good will. I am terribly afraid that henceforth it will be stated that the Olympics generate international controversy.... I deeply feel that South Africa should not be barred from competing in the 1968 summer Olympic Games."³¹⁵

Considerations of fair and unfair treatment, of countries reprehensible or commendable, frequently shifted towards a discussion of the political characteristics by which such distinctions should be made, in particular between the Communist and non-Communist countries of the time. Here, the exclusion of South Africa was often understood as a victory for 'blackmail' from the Communist Bloc countries who were identified negatively by their support for what was seen as problematic opposition from Black African countries. Correspondent Andrew McAllister spoke of the Games becoming a weapon for "Communists against the Free World," warning that the USA should not compete in the Games in order to send a message to the world that it would not submit to blackmail from Communists or "the black power block."³¹⁶ Dewey Taft argued that the IOC shocked the entire world by barring South Africa while allowing "barbarian professionals from Communist countries" to dominate the Games.³¹⁷ Ralph Russell interpreted South Africa's exclusion as "another stunning victory for the Communist conspiracy. By this one act," he criticized the IOC, "you have changed the Games from an athletic event to a political/racial sideshow. You will have allowed the Communists to use the Games as a tool for political propaganda. Try to think of

the black and white athletes of the Union of South Africa, these men and women have worked just as hard and waited just as long as their counterparts in the other countries for a chance that will never come their way again.”³¹⁸ J.D. Bell also expressed his disdain for the IOC’s “[y]ielding to such flagrant blackmail ... [which] has utterly destroyed its image and prestige. It was a shocking exhibition of cowardice and unjustified prejudice.”³¹⁹

Charles Soltis, on the other hand, acknowledged the difficult position Brundage and the IOC had found themselves in as they sought to bring about a resolution of the issue, but, he noted, the organization would have emerged stronger had it “taken a stand on principle – that it keep the door barred to political pressure and interference; that the original vote to reinstate the Republic of South Africa was valid and should not have been brought up again.” Surely, nobody would have equated the acceptance of South Africa with an endorsement of its racial politics: “I am positive that the participation of Russia in the Olympic Games cannot be interpreted to mean that the people of the world at large approve of the system of Communism.” In consequence of the IOC’s actions, Soltis concluded, “the future of the Olympic Games has been weakened ... not strengthened; ...this short-sighted decision based on politics and expediency will introduce long-run problem of monumental proportions.”³²⁰

Brundage in dealing with the torrent of correspondence precipitated by the exclusion of South Africa, largely held fast to his strategic position, insisting that the decisions were driven by considerations internal to the Olympic community, and not by political objectives; therefore, no Olympic principles were abandoned. His defense

remained consistent, as is evidenced by several pieces of similar correspondence, for which the following is a typical example:

The Olympic Movement with its basic principle of no discrimination of any kind found itself of all places in the middle of this terrible international racial conflict.... We saved the Games of the XIX Olympiad and prevented a complete rupture in the world of international sport without yielding any Olympic Principles. However, it is a sad commentary on our so-called civilization that one cannot stage Games designed to promote international friendship without demonstrations, boycotts, disorder and violence.³²¹

Some people commended Brundage on his strength and resilience. Sgt. James E. Moore thanked Brundage for his unwavering stand. He acknowledged that the international pressure on Brundage must have been immense at a time when Brundage also had to manage conflicting national interests. He suggested that the IOC "... release to UPI or the AP the two IOC votes country by country which eventually disqualified South Africa from the Olympics. The sports fans of this world are entitled to know how treacherous and backbiting some of the Nations really are."³²² Such an act would have been beyond Brundage's authority, however, and it would have amounted to a breach of trust. The stability of the Olympic Movement, whose credibility had already suffered in consequence of these developments, might well have been crushed by such an incident. After all, it was not uncommon to encounter opinions of the IOC such as that espoused by Marjorie Headly, who was sharply critical of the men "who sit as officials in the Olympic Committee [who] are, in my opinion, a bunch of self-righteous hypocrites, who, while maintaining that the Olympics are nonpartisan, which it is not, has dragged the question of political expediency into the sports arena...."³²³

Brundage and the IOC, it was clear, were walking a fine line; no matter what decision the Movement arrived at in the end, it was certain to generate opposition and hostility to the same degree that it gave rise to approbation and approval. The exclusion of South Africa from the 1968 Mexico City Olympic Games, did nothing to resolve these tensions.

7. Discussion: Developments during the Period, 1964-1968

It was clear by the 1968 Mexico City Olympic Games that the ‘three dominant voices’—South African Olympic affiliates, domestic resistance, and international community—were representative of two distinct sides of the South African situation: supportive of South Africa’s re-admittance or supportive of South Africa’s banishment. The result of the IOC vote to readmit South Africa to the Mexico City Games sparked unprecedented discussion and divide. Nonetheless, there was sufficient evidence for explaining the IOC’s ultimate stance. Though each voice continued to espouse a recognizable message, the international community dominated the discourse.

The three factors that shaped the final decision regarding South Africa’s participation in the 1960 Rome Games and 1964 Tokyo Games remained relevant in the IOC’s decision to withdraw South Africa’s invitation to the 1968 Mexico City Games. First of all, at the core of the debate, as it had been for over a decade, was Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter*. Arguments based on a combination of Articles 1, 24, and 25 contributed to the withdrawal of South Africa’s invitation to the 1968 Mexico City Games. Article 1 forbade any racial discrimination, Article 24 instructed NOCs to

follow the rules and regulations of the IOC, and Article 25 emphasized the need for NOCs to be politically independent and autonomous, able “to resist all political, religious or commercial pressure... National Olympic Committees that do not conform to the Rules and Regulations of the International Olympic Committee forfeit their recognition and their right to send participants to the Olympic Games.”³²⁴

SANOC tried to overcome the discrimination and racism in South African sport by brokering concessions with the government that allowed SANOC to select a multi-racial team. However, the sticking issue was the point succinctly stated by Mexico’s IOC member José de Jesus Clark:

There is no doubt that the desire of all voters was to eliminate racial discrimination, with the only difference that some aimed at maintaining non-discrimination within the stipulations of Rule No. 1, in a permanent way and as one of the basic fundamentals of the Olympic Ideal, and the others only thought of eliminating discrimination in the specific representation of a country at the Olympic Games, which in essence, is contradictory to the Ideal and does not offer a definite and permanent solution.³²⁵

Although Brundage and other IOC members viewed Article 1 as only applicable to a country’s Olympic team in regard to the Olympic Games itself, the interpretation of Article 1 as a permanent, basic fundamental Olympic Ideal dominated the debate that led to South Africa’s suspension for both the 1964 and 1968 Olympic Games.

Second, the IOC’s trust in its own protocol and structure affected decisions as the 1968 Mexico City Games approached. The SANOC delegation had the opportunity to present its case to the IOC Executive Board and General Session for reinstatement to the Olympic Games. As a result, an IOC South Africa Commission (SAC) was assembled to evaluate the sport landscape in South Africa devoid of any political considerations.

SAC's directive was to specifically investigate if SANOC complied with Article 24 and 25 of the *Olympic Charter*. Remaining distant from any resolutions or recommendations to the IOC membership, SAC presented a report of its findings in South Africa. Based on SANOC's willingness and preparedness to form a mixed team for the upcoming Mexico City Games and the results of SAC's report, a resolution was approved by an absolute majority that allowed SANOC to enter a team into the 1968 Olympic Games. According to the conditions of the resolution, as long as SANOC's team conformed specifically to Article 1, in addition to the other rules and regulations, of the *Olympic Charter* and SANOC's efforts continued to remove all racial discrimination from amateur sport, the question of South Africa's participation in the IOC, Olympic Games, and Olympic Movement would not be reconsidered until 1970. This decision created international controversy.

As a result of a large faction unhappy with the re-admission of South Africa to the Olympic Games, the goal of those who opposed the Grenoble vote was to call an Extraordinary Session to discuss the South African situation and, possibly, muster another vote. After much discussion about the various rules that could have been invoked to force Brundage to call a plenary session, Brundage had an emergency meeting with the Mexican delegation of Ramírez Vázquez, Gómez, and Clark in Chicago. Brundage received a petition from the Chairman of the Mexican Organizing Committee, Ramírez Vázquez, that set into motion Article 41 of the *Olympic Charter*, which allowed an Organizing Committee to submit a request to the Executive Board to decide on a matter of controversy of a non-technical nature concerning the Olympic Games. Without that particular request, the whole controversy would not have been

discussed in a timely manner. Article 41 was responsible for opening a much needed discussion on South Africa. Due to Brundage's Chicago meeting, he decided to call a special Executive Board meeting to discuss the South African situation. The result of the 1968 Lausanne Executive Board meeting was a unanimous proposal to withdraw SANOC's invitation to the Mexico City Games. The proposal was approved by the IOC membership through the administration of a postal vote.

Third, the IOC was unwillingly drawn into the political and domestic issues entangled in the South African situation. SANOC's re-admittance to the 1968 Mexico City Games while South Africa's apartheid policies did not fully allow SANOC to properly abide by Articles 1, 24, and 25 triggered international and political unrest, which led to the threat of a boycott. The opposition to South Africa's participation was based on an anti-apartheid movement, which was a stand against South Africa's laws and policies. This politically charged group smothered the discussion in regard to SANOC's participation in the Olympic Games, giving the IOC no choice but to succumb to international and political pressure. However, according to Brundage, the reason for withdrawing the invitation to South Africa for the Olympic Games was to prevent a violent and dangerous atmosphere in Mexico City.

It is reasonable to conclude, then, that this latter point dominated how Brundage and the IOC handled the South African situation during the period leading up to the 1968 Mexico City Games. The Grenoble vote triggered an international controversy that made politics the overwhelming factor. However, it was protocol and procedure that masked the political undertones of the IOC's decision-making. Protocol and structure allowed Brundage to call a special Executive Board session that was

responsible for issuing a postal vote, which overturned the Grenoble vote, resulting in the withdrawal of the invitation to South Africa to the Mexico City Games. The ultimate rationale to withdraw the invitation was creating a safe environment for a successful Games, not the political pressure to make an anti-apartheid stance. Nonetheless, though protocol and structure were a tool to succumb to international and political pressures, protocol and structure were not the main impetuses that led to SANOC's suspension.

Based on the correspondence from 1964 to 1968, Brundage's and the IOC's decisions were dominated by: (a) IOC rules and regulations, and (b) the influence of political and domestic issues. Focussing on these two points helps to understand why South Africa's invitation for the 1968 Mexico City Games was withdrawn. Despite SANOC's argument that it had overcome the charges of non-compliance with IOC rules, through the concessions wrung from the government, violations of Articles 1, 24, and 25 of the *Olympic Charter* were unavoidable. Further, the controversy spawning from the Grenoble vote became a public image disaster. It ignited international attention and pressure that was too great for the IOC to handle. Domestic resistance support and international community perspectives were finally extremely influential factors in SANOC's suspension. There were two catalyzing elements missing from the domestic resistance and international community correspondence leading up to the 1960 Rome Games and 1964 Tokyo Games, but that made their correspondence effective leading up to the 1968 Mexico City Games. First, the Grenoble vote allowing SANOC to enter a team in the Mexico City Games sparked an international controversy – people questioned how an apartheid laden South

Africa could be allowed to participate in the Olympics. Second, because of the international attention, IOC and NOC members felt pressure to overturn the Grenoble vote; this in itself provided more substance and support to domestic resistance and international community forces.

The IOC's decisions did result in South Africa's invitation to be withdrawn, but Brundage's publicly stated reason was to provide a safe environment for a successful Olympic Games. Even if the underlying reason for withdrawing SANOC's invitation was political pressure, racial discrimination as an explicit reason for South Africa's suspension was in the background. Due to the initial decision of the IOC from the Grenoble vote and the explanation given for the final result from the subsequent vote, do these points lend credence to identify here a case for structural racism? Supporting SANOC's re-entry to the Olympic Games and not explicitly referencing racial discrimination as a reason to withdraw its invitation does raise some questions. For Brundage and some IOC members, it was a matter of how one interpreted the application of the *Olympic Charter*. However, regardless of whether one wished to limit applicability of IOC general principles to the Olympic Games only or sought to extend their applicability beyond the Olympics themselves, South African laws and policies were racially discriminatory and SANOC had to work within those laws and policies. The latter interpretation of IOC's general principles made the decision to banish South Africa from the Olympic Movement easy. Abiding by the former interpretation of the general principles indeed amounted to structural racism. Although SANOC assured fielding a mixed team, whites and non-whites could not train together or compete against each other. Under those circumstances, in accepting

a mixed team, the IOC condoned discriminatory practices. Further, the Grenoble resolution that achieved an absolute majority and allowed SANOC to field a team in the Olympic Games, had two major deficiencies. First, the one condition retained from the Baden-Baden resolution—SANOC had to publicly dissociate itself from the South African government's policy of non-competition and non-integration of whites and non-whites—strangely no longer was a concern in the Grenoble resolution. Second, the wording of the Grenoble resolution indicated that the IOC was aware of racial discrimination in South African sport and society.

The organized efforts of those who opposed SANOC and the South African government were the largest and most effective of those during the three time periods examined in this dissertation. However, what did the withdrawal of the invitation for a second time mean for the South African sporting situation? Would the government relax its apartheid policies enough for SANOC to field a team in the next Olympic Games? Or would South Africa be uninvited again from the 1972 Munich Olympic Games?

Endnotes for Chapter Four

- ¹ Braun to Brundage, 23 September 1965, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ² Giulio Onesti to Brundage, 2 October 1965, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ³ Ibid.
- ⁴ Honey to Brundage, October 1965, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ⁵ International Olympic Committee (hereafter cited as IOC), "1965. Madrid," in *IOC Executive Committee Minutes, Volume II (1948-1969)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 184.
- ⁶ IOC, "64th IOC Session, Madrid, 1965," in *IOC General Session Minutes, Volume IV (1956-1988)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 103. Underscored in original.
- ⁷ Brundage to Braun, 20 October 1965, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ⁸ L. Zanchi to SANOC, 26 October 1965, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ⁹ IOC, "1966. Rome," in *IOC Executive Committee Minutes, Volume II (1948-1969)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 186.
- ¹⁰ Ibid.
- ¹¹ IOC, "65th IOC Session, Rome, 1966," in *IOC General Session Minutes, Volume IV (1956-1988)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 117. Underscored in original.
- ¹² Memorandum from R.S. Alexander, 16 June 1966, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹³ Brundage to Honey, 23 September 1966, ABC, box 58, reel 34.
- ¹⁴ Honey to Brundage, 11 October 1966, ABC, box 58, reel 34. Although Johann Westerhoff was employed as the IOC Secretary General, he was not a member of the IOC.
- ¹⁵ IOC, "1966. Mexico City," in *IOC Executive Committee Minutes, Volume II (1948-1969)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 190.
- ¹⁶ J.W. Westerhoff to Braun, 5 January 1967, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ¹⁷ IOC, "1967. Copenhagen," in *IOC Executive Committee Minutes, Volume II (1948-1969)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 194.
- ¹⁸ Westerhoff to Braun, 28 February 1967, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ¹⁹ Braun to Brundage, 5 April 1967, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²⁰ IOC, "1967. Tehran," in *IOC Executive Committee Minutes, Volume II (1948-1969)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 197.

- 21 IOC, "66th IOC Session, Tehran, 1967," in *IOC General Session Minutes, Volume IV (1956-1988)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 126.
- 22 SANOC Report, 15 May 1967, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 23 IOC, "66th IOC Session, Tehran, 1967," in *IOC General Session Minutes, Volume IV (1956-1988)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 126.
- 24 SANOC Report, 15 May 1967, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 25 Ibid.
- 26 Ibid.
- 27 Ibid.
- 28 Ibid.
- 29 Westerhoff to Braun, 6 July 1967, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 30 Westerhoff to Braun, 6 July 1967, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 31 Killanin to Braun, 25 September 1967, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 32 IOC, "1967. Lausanne," in *IOC Executive Committee Minutes, Volume II (1948-1969)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 200.
- 33 Killanin to Honey, 18 December 1967, ABC, box 58, reel 34.
- 34 Braun to Brundage, 10 January 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 35 Ibid.
- 36 Brundage to Braun, 12 January 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 37 Braun Statement, 3 February 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 Ibid.
- 40 Ibid.
- 41 IOC, "67th IOC Session, Grenoble, 1968," in *IOC General Session Minutes, Volume IV (1956-1988)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 133-4.
- 42 Braun to Brundage, 19 February 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 43 Westerhoff to Braun, 27 February 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 44 Westerhoff to Braun, 27 February 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 45 Braun to Brundage, 26 February 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 83.
- 46 Westerhoff to Brundage, 6 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 83.
- 47 Ibid.
- 48 Ibid.
- 49 Brundage to Westerhoff, 7 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 83.
- 50 Brundage to Braun, 9 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 83.
- 51 Brundage to Honey, 9 March 1968, ABC, box 58, reel 34.
- 52 Brundage to Westerhoff, 18 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 83.
- 53 Brundage to IOC Members, NOC Members, and ISFs, 18 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 83.
- 54 Ibid.

- 55 Ibid.
- 56 Ibid.
- 57 Brundage to IOC Executive Board Members, 28 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 83. Underscored in original.
- 58 Killanin to Braun, 30 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 83.
- 59 Braun to Brundage, 30 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 83.
- 60 Ibid.
- 61 IOC, "1968. Lausanne," in *IOC Executive Committee Minutes, Volume II (1948-1969)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992).
- 62 Ibid, 208.
- 63 Ibid, 208-9.
- 64 Ibid, 208-9.
- 65 Brundage Cablegram, undated, ABC, box 147, reel 83.
- 66 Ibid.
- 67 Brundage Release, 3 May 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 68 Ibid.
- 69 Brundage Press Release, 23 August 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 70 Honey to Brundage, 26 August 1968, ABC, box 58, reel 34.
- 71 Brundage to Honey, 27 August 1968, ABC, box 58, reel 34.
- 72 Emery to Brundage, 30 October 1964, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 73 Brundage to Emery, 12 November 1964, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 74 Emery to Brundage, 13 January 1965, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 75 Emery to Brundage, 15 March 1965, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 76 Emery to Brundage, 14 May 1965, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 77 Brundage to Emery, 14 September 1965, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 78 Emery to Brundage, 20 October 1965, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 79 Ibid.
- 80 Brundage to Emery, 28 December 1965, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 81 Emery to SANOC, 9 February 1966, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 82 Emery to Brundage, 9 February 1966, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 83 Ibid.
- 84 Brundage to Emery, 17 February 1966, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 85 Emery to Brundage, 28 April 1966, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 86 Emery to Brundage, 3 May 1966, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 87 Brundage to Emery, 19 May 1966, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 88 Emery to Brundage, 21 June 1966, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 89 Brundage to Emery, 30 June 1966, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 90 Brundage to Emery, 16 November 1966, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 91 Emery to Brundage, 20 February 1967, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- 92 Emery to Brundage, 7 March 1967, ABC, box 145, reel 81.

- ⁹³ Brundage to Emery, 7 April 1967, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- ⁹⁴ Emery to Brundage, 13 April 1967, ABC box 145, reel 81; Brundage to Emery, 20 April 1967, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- ⁹⁵ Brundage to Emery, 23 June 1967, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- ⁹⁶ Emery to Brundage, 21 September 1967, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- ⁹⁷ Brundage to Emery, 9 October 1967, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- ⁹⁸ Emery to Brundage, 23 April 1968, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- ⁹⁹ Brundage to Emery, 3 May, 1968, ABC, box 145, reel 81.
- ¹⁰⁰ Brundage to Emery, 10 June 1968, ABC, box 145, reel 81
- ¹⁰¹ IOC, "65th IOC Session, Rome, 1966," in IOC General Session Minutes, Volume IV (1956-1988), translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 117.
- ¹⁰² IOC, "1966. Mexico City," in IOC Executive Committee Minutes, Volume II (1948-1969), translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 190.
- ¹⁰³ Alexander to Brundage, 8 August 1966, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹⁰⁴ Alexander to Westerhoff, 2 September 1966, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹⁰⁵ Brundage to Alexander, 24 September 1966, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹⁰⁶ Alexander to Brundage, 30 September 1966, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹⁰⁷ Alexander to Braun, 19 November 1966, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹⁰⁸ Alexander to Westerhoff, 13 January 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹⁰⁹ Alexander to D. McIlldowie, 17 January 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹¹⁰ Alexander to Braun, 23 January 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹¹¹ Alexander to Ademola, 23 January 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹¹² Alexander to Ademola, 26 January, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹¹³ Brundage to Ademola, 19 May 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹¹⁴ Killanin to Brundage, 2 June 1967, ABC, box 58, reel 35.
- ¹¹⁵ Ademola to Brundage, 5 June 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹¹⁶ Westerhoff to Alexander, 31 January 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹¹⁷ Alexander to Westerhoff, 4 February 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹¹⁸ Ibid.
- ¹¹⁹ Alexander to Westerhoff, 6 February 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹²⁰ Herman van Karnebeek to Brudange, 20 June 1967, ABC, box 58, reel 34.
- ¹²¹ Brundage to Killanin, 23 June 1967, ABC, box 58, reel 35.
- ¹²² Brundage to Karnebeek, 26 June 1967, ABC, box 58, reel 34.
- ¹²³ Ademola to Westerhoff, 17 July 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹²⁴ Westerhoff to Killanin, 28 June 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 54.
- ¹²⁵ Killanin to Brundage, 28 June 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹²⁶ Alexander to Brundage, 8 July 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55; Killanin to Alexander, 11 July 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ¹²⁷ Killanin to Westerhoff, 7 July 1967, ABC, box 58, reel 35.

- 128 Killanin to Brundage, 30 June 1967, ABC, box 58, reel 35.
- 129 Killanin to Brundage, 8 July 1967, ABC, box 58, reel 35.
- 130 Killanin to Alexander, 19 July 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- 131 Ibid.
- 132 Francey to Westerhoff, 18 July 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- 133 Ibid.
- 134 IOC Press Release, *IOC Commission in South Africa*, 10 August 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- 135 Killanin to Westerhoff, 16 August 1967, ABC, box 58, reel 35.
- 136 Ibid.
- 137 Killanin to Brundage, 19 August 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- 138 Alexander to Braun, 21 August 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- 139 Alexander to Westerhoff, 25 August 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- 140 Alexander to Braun, 29 August 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- 141 Ibid.
- 142 Killanin to Ademola, 29 August 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- 143 Brundage to South Africa Commission, 31 August 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- 144 Killanin to Brundage, 1 December 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- 145 Killanin to Braun, 18 December 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- 146 Killanin to Braun, 22 December 1967, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- 147 South Africa Commission Report, undated, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 148 Alexander to Brundage, 27 December 1967, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 149 Killanin to Westerhoff, 1 January 1968, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- 150 Killanin to Alexander, 4 January 1968, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- 151 Ademola to Alexander, 12 January 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 152 Killanin to Brundage, 18 January 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 153 This section of the dissertation focusses on emphasizing arguments raised in favour of the dominant positions – those who were in favour of re-admitting SANOC to the 1968 Mexico City Games and those who were opposed to it.
- 154 Killanin to Brundage, 10 February 1968, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- 155 IOC, “68th IOC Session, Mexico, 1968,” in *IOC General Session Minutes, Volume IV (1956-1988)*, translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg (London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992), 144.
- 156 Alexander to Braun, 20 February 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 157 Onesti to Brundage, 21 February 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 158 Ibid.
- 159 Stoytchev to Brundage 27 February 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 160 Killanin to Brundage, 28 February 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 161 Ibid.
- 162 Pedro Ramírez Vázquez, Marte R. Gómez, José de Jesus Clark to Brundage, 28 February 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 163 Ibid.

- 164 Alexander to Brundage, 29 February 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 165 Onesti to Brundage, 29 February 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 166 Giorgio De Stefani to Brundage, 1 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 167 Marquess of Exeter to Brundage, 1 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 168 Brundage Memorandum, 1 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 169 Alexander to Brundage, 2 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 170 Hugh Weir to Brundage, undated, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 171 Ibid.
- 172 Ibid.
- 173 Exeter to Brundage, 2 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 174 Ibid.
- 175 Ivar Vind to Brundage (telegram), 5 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 176 Vind to Brundage (letter), 5 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 177 Ibid.
- 178 Ramírez Vázquez, Gómez, and Clark to Executive Board Members, 6 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 179 Vind to Brundage, 7 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 180 Clark to IOC Executive Board, 11 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 181 Ibid.
- 182 Konstantin Andrianov to Brundage, 11 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 183 Ibid.
- 184 Andrianov to IOC Members, undated, ABC, box 147, reel 82 found in *ibid.*
- 185 Ibid.
- 186 Árpád Csanádi to Brundage, 8 April 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 187 Brundage to Exeter, 12 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 188 Ibid.
- 189 Brundage to Onesti, 12 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 190 Georg von Opel to Brundage, 13 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82. Underscored in original.
- 191 Ibid.
- 192 Ibid.
- 193 Exeter to Brundage, 15 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 194 Lichtenstein to Andrianov, 18 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82 found in *ibid.*
- 195 Ibid.
- 196 Exeter to Brundage, 18 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 197 Alexander to Brundage, 20 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82. Underscored in original.
- 198 Brundage to von Opel, 20 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 199 George W. (Prince of Hanover) to Stoytchev, 15 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82 found in George W. to Brundage, 27 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 200 Rada Bhalindra Singh to Westerhoff, 28 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- 201 Vind to Brundage, 28 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.

- ²⁰² Onesti to Brundage, 29 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82. Underscored in original.
- ²⁰³ Brundage to Killanin, 2 April 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²⁰⁴ Ibid.
- ²⁰⁵ Brundage to Andrianov, 8 April 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²⁰⁶ Alexander to Brundage, 13 April 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82. Underscored in original.
- ²⁰⁷ Roby to Brundage 15 April 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²⁰⁸ Brundage Memorandum, 24 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁰⁹ Ibid.
- ²¹⁰ Brundage to IOC Members and Perhaps Others, undated, ABC, box 144, reel 81. Underscored in original.
- ²¹¹ Ibid.
- ²¹² Weir to Brundage, 25 April 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²¹³ Ibid.
- ²¹⁴ Brundage to Weir, 15 June 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²¹⁵ Killanin to Brundage, 6 June 1968, ABC, box 59, reel 35.
- ²¹⁶ Ibid.
- ²¹⁷ Brundage to Killanin, 7 July 1968, ABC, box 59, reel 35.
- ²¹⁸ John Rogers to Brundage, October 1965, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²¹⁹ C.D. de Broglio to Brundage, 2 July 1966, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²²⁰ Brutus to Brundage, 24 November 1966, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²²¹ Brutus to Brundage, 3 December 1966, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²²² Brutus to Brundage, 3 January 1967, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²²³ Westerhoff to C.D. de Broglio, 5 January 1967, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²²⁴ Brundage to Brutus, 16 January 1967, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²²⁵ Brundage to Rathinasany, 25 March 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²²⁶ Rathinasany to Mayer, 31 May 1963, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²²⁷ Alexander to Chris de Broglio, 7 December 1966, ABC, box 101, reel 55.
- ²²⁸ Brutus to Brundage, 9 February 1967, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²²⁹ Brutus to Brundage, 19 April 1967, ABC, box 147, reel 82. Capitalized in original.
- ²³⁰ De Broglio Release, 25 June 1967, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²³¹ Ibid.
- ²³² Ibid.
- ²³³ Ibid.
- ²³⁴ Dennis Brutus Statement, 31 January 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²³⁵ Brutus to Brundage, 31 January 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.
- ²³⁶ Ibid.
- ²³⁷ Reg Hlongwane to Brundage, undated, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²³⁸ Brutus to Brundage, 16 February 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82. Underscored in original.
- ²³⁹ Ibid.
- ²⁴⁰ Chris de Broglio to Killanin, undated, ABC, box 147, reel 82 found in Killanin to Ademola, 9 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.

²⁴¹ Ibid.

²⁴² Ibid.

²⁴³ Killanin to de Broglio, 9 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82 found in Killanin to Ademola, 9 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.

²⁴⁴ Brutus to Brundage, 15 April 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 83.

²⁴⁵ Since the collection had many letters from multiple sources, a smaller selection was utilized in this section to showcase the two main positions – those who were in favour of re-admitting SANOC and those who were against readmitting SANOC into the 1968 Mexico City Games.

²⁴⁶ P.B. Woolley to Brundage, 23 November 1965, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

²⁴⁷ Jackie Robinson to Brundage, 21 March 1967, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

²⁴⁸ Starling A. Hutt to Brundage, 27 November 1967, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

²⁴⁹ Ralph Boston to Brundage, 29 November 1967, ABC, box 144, reel 81. Bolded in original.

²⁵⁰ Brundage to Jacobson, 7 December 1967, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

²⁵¹ M.O. Whitsel Sr. to Brundage, 15 December 1967, ABC, box 144, reel 81. Underscored in original.

²⁵² Ralph Davis to Brundage, 18 December 1967, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

²⁵³ John Laird to Brundage, 18 December 1967, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

²⁵⁴ Vera Herstman to Brundage, 19 December 1967, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

²⁵⁵ D.K. Miller to Brundage, 21 December 1967, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

²⁵⁶ Ardis Bryant to Brundage, December 1967, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

²⁵⁷ Earlier referred to in context of United States Olympic Association.

²⁵⁸ Elizabeth Moore to Douglas Roby, 13 January 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

²⁵⁹ Joseph and Carol Schwab to Brundage, 13 January 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

²⁶⁰ Margaret Flory to Roby and Brundage, 15 January 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

²⁶¹ Rudolph Balsiger to IOC Members, 15 January 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

²⁶² Ibid.

²⁶³ Ibid. Balsiger offered as retrospective confirmation of his concern the fact that Harris was later charged with terrorism activities by the apartheid government, and executed by hanging.

²⁶⁴ Ibid. Underscored in original.

²⁶⁵ Robert Maurer to Brundage, 16 January 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81; Mathew Ahmann to Brundage, 17 January 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81; Arne Sovik to Brundage, 17 January 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

²⁶⁶ Leon Shull to Brundage, 18 January 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81; J. Murray MacInnes to Brundage, 18 January 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81; Tim Smith to Brundage, 18 January 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81; Edwin Luidens to Brundage, 22 January 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

²⁶⁷ Leon Shull to Brundage, 18 January 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

²⁶⁸ Ibid.

²⁶⁹ Bruce A. Cronnell to Brundage, 23 January 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

²⁷⁰ Vel Phillips and Better Mae Eisendath to Brundage, 24 January 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

- ²⁷¹ Elizabeth Landis to Brundage, 25 January 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁷² Ibid. Underscored in original.
- ²⁷³ James Dorothy and Tina Bristol to Brundage, 26 January 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁷⁴ Lars Borge-Anderson to Brundage, 29 January 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁷⁵ Palmer Van Gundy to Brundage, 1 February 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁷⁶ George Houser to Westerhoff, 15 February 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁷⁷ Geoffrey Picard to ACA Representatives, 27 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁷⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁷⁹ The National Executive Board and Pan African Students' Organization in the Americas to Brundage, 27 February 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁸⁰ Leonard H. West III to Brundage, 17 February 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁸¹ David H. Rubenstein to Brundage, 1 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁸² Henry Cathles to Brundage, 27 February 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁸³ Nancy Lee Hanson to Brundage, 3 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁸⁴ T.R. Kendrick III to Brundage, 4 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁸⁵ Forbes Norris to Brundage, 5 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁸⁶ See Forrest Johnson to Brundage, 5 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81, and Rev. John Morris to Brundage, 7 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁸⁷ Sir Arnold Lunn to Brundage, 5 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81. Underscored in original.
- ²⁸⁸ *Request to the IOC on the African Problem*, 4 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81 found Hideji Kawasaki to Brundage, 6 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁸⁹ Rt. Rev. C. Edward Crowther to Brundage, 6 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁹⁰ Brundage to Rogers, 7 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁹¹ Brundage to Hanson, 7 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81; Brundage to Kendrick, 7 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81; Brundage to Pape, 14 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁹² Brundage to Cathles, 8 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁹³ Ellen C. Adams to International Leaders and Organizations, 11 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁹⁴ Brundage to Hugh McGee, 14 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81; Brundage to Carl Bauer, 18 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81; Brundage to James Wilson, 18 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81; Brundage to James Lee, 18 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81; Brundage to Joseph Pratt, 18 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81; Brundage to Ira Nadler, 18 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81; Brundage to Mosler, 3 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁹⁵ Abbreviated Translation of a Letter from Alejandro Sanchez Robles, 21 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁹⁶ Edwin Mosler, Jr. to Brundage, 26 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁹⁷ Janet Spring to Brundage, 22 March March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁹⁸ Grace M. Campbell to Oficina de Control de las Alojamentos, 25 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ²⁹⁹ Kawasaki to Brundage, 25 March 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.

- ³⁰⁰ Ira Gillet to Brundage, 5 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³⁰¹ Lyn Moran to Brundage, 6 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81. Underscored in original.
- ³⁰² George Houser to Brundage 10 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³⁰³ Brundage to Gillet, 12 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81; see also, Brundage to Kawasaki, 10 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³⁰⁴ Mr. and Mrs. W.J. Givan to Brundage, 23 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81. Capitalized in original.
- ³⁰⁵ Philip Melnick to Brundage, 23 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³⁰⁶ J. Maurice Clark to Westerhoff, 23 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³⁰⁷ P.F.S. Otten to Brundage, 24 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³⁰⁸ Ernst V. Lotz to State Journal, undated, ABC, box 144, reel 81 found in State Journal Editor to Brundage, 24 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³⁰⁹ Mr. and Mrs. V. Haldiman to Brundage, 25 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³¹⁰ Edward Schinman to IOC, 5 June 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³¹¹ Stuart Morris to Brundage, 24 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81. Underscored in original.
- ³¹² Ibid.
- ³¹³ Peter Luisa to IOC, 24 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³¹⁴ Rutherford Platt to IOC, 24 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³¹⁵ Alan Cochet to Brundage, 25 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³¹⁶ Andrew McAllister to Brundage, 25 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³¹⁷ Dewey Taft to Brundage, 25 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³¹⁸ Ralph Russell to IOC, 25 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³¹⁹ J.D. Bell to Braun, 25 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³²⁰ Charles Soltis to Brundage, 26 April 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³²¹ Brundage to Eddy, 16 June 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81; see also, Brundage to Blake, 13 June 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81; Brundage to Loeb, 16 June 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81; Brundage to Maritz, 13 July 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³²² Sgt. James E. Moore to Brundage, 21 June 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³²³ Marjorie Headly to IOC, 4 September 1968, ABC, box 144, reel 81.
- ³²⁴ IOC, *The Olympic Games: Fundamental Principles, Rules and Regulations, General Information* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 1967), 20.
- ³²⁵ Clark to IOC Executive Board, 11 March 1968, ABC, box 147, reel 82.

Chapter Five:

Summary and Conclusions

1. South Africa, Brundage, and the IOC

When Avery Brundage was sworn in as the International Olympic Committee (IOC) President in 1952, he did not know what the future held for him, the IOC, Olympic Games, or Olympic Movement. However, he did know how he wanted to portray Olympism and the Olympic Movement within the context of the IOC's history. Regardless of what the future held, his vision of an amateur, non-political, and non-commercial Olympic experience remained central to the decision-making of the IOC to foster success and growth of the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement. As leader of the IOC, Brundage had great responsibility as the face of the Olympic Movement, which also made him the target of those who challenged the IOC and what it represented. One such challenge was created by the South African situation.

South Africa's participation in the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement from 1956 to 1970 was a heavily questioned issue because of its apartheid policies that enforced racial segregation. According to the archival correspondence, the challenge of racial discrimination in South Africa formally confronted the IOC for the first time in 1954. Initially, Brundage tried, unsuccessfully, to manage the South African situation by consulting directly with the South African National Olympic Committee (SANOC) through its Secretary General, Ira Emery. Largely from Emery's viewpoint, Brundage began to familiarize himself with the South African governmental and sporting landscape, trusting SANOC would combat the racial discrimination issues

affecting South African Olympic sports as best it could in order to incorporate the non-white community.

With government policies becoming more restrictive, and the South African sport landscape for non-whites not improving, a domestic resistance movement slowly gained ground under the leadership of Dennis Brutus. The South African Sports Association (SASA), formed in 1958, grew out of this movement; it was founded to address the discrimination in South African sport. This served to increase concerns at the IOC about South Africa's place in the IOC and Olympic Movement, in particular since SASA was able to reach out to the international community. Although SANOC and the IOC were able to channel the pressure from domestic resistance organizations and the interested international community leading up to the 1960 Rome Games, this was not the case for the 1964 Tokyo Games and 1968 Mexico City Games.

Through the reconstruction of the correspondence surrounding the South African situation, it was evident that Brundage and the IOC had to negotiate with 'three dominant voices' after the 1956 Melbourne Games until the 1968 Mexico City Games: (1) South African Olympic affiliates; (2) domestic resistance; and, (3) international community. Within each time period between the Olympic Games—1956 to 1960, 1960 to 1964, and 1964 to 1968—the IOC received and transferred thousands of pages of material discussing South Africa's place in the IOC, Olympic Games, and Olympic Movement. Each time period was dominated by one of the 'three dominant voices', but the stance of each voice was consistent over the 12-year period, even though the details of the South African situation from Games to Games were in flux.

By the 1960 Rome Games, the basic details of the South African sport climate under apartheid were in place, establishing the context for each voice. The South African Olympic affiliates, controlled by SANOC, acknowledged that there was a racial problem, but did little to challenge the status quo. Although help from the IOC was appreciated, SANOC wanted to remain in control so it could confine the matter to the domestic sphere. The South African domestic resistance, led by Dennis Brutus and SASA, desired an inclusive sport system where non-whites could compete internationally for South Africa. The domestic resistance sphere remained singularly dissatisfied with SANOC's effort and called for urgent measures from the IOC. Voices from the international sporting community likewise constructed a narrative of disappointment, and consequently sought to pressure the IOC to take control by either resolving the racial discrimination issue or expel South Africa from the IOC, Olympic Games, and Olympic Movement.

As the 1964 Tokyo Games approached, each voice continued to focus on a distinct narrative. SANOC argued that the racial discrimination in sport was diminishing as a result of its integration of non-white athletes and associations through affiliation with legitimate National Sports Federations (NSF). SANOC assumed that it had firm control, and that it had fulfilled both the promises made by Reginald Honey at the 1960 Rome IOC General Session and the obligations under the 1963 Baden-Baden resolution. Domestic resistance forces thought the South African Olympic affiliates had failed to improve the non-white sporting experience. Racial discrimination in sport was still prevalent, perhaps even worsening. The affiliation terms offered to non-white associations were restrictive and unfair, and government policies

continued to discourage mixed sport. The international community continued to support the domestic resistance, realizing that discrimination in South African sport remained commonplace – SANOC was not abiding by its obligations to fully incorporate non-whites into the South African sporting structure. Both domestic resistance and the international community demanded the suspension of SANOC from the Olympic Games and would have preferred it if the IOC had gone one step further and expelled SANOC from the IOC and replace it with a non-racial National Olympic Committee.

By the 1968 Mexico City Games, the ‘three dominant voices’ represented two distinct sides of the South African situation: supportive of South Africa’s re-admittance or supportive of South Africa’s banishment. Due to its suspension from the 1964 Tokyo Games, SANOC was determined to achieve re-admittance to the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement. It thought the unprecedented concessions by the government combined with the positive progress shown in the IOC’s South Africa Commission report would guarantee re-admittance to the Olympic Games. Those who opposed the discriminatory practices of SANOC and South Africa did not yield their argument to keep SANOC out of the Olympic Games. The opposition considered the concessions made by the government to accommodate non-white athletes to be minor and a diversion from the continued discriminatory practices in South African sport. The dominant domestic resistance entities from 1956 to 1964—SASA and the South African Non-Racial Open Committee (SAN-ROC)—weakened, but domestic resistance acquired a new source of support that maintained a contradictory stance with SANOC’s ongoing progress: the IOC and NOC members who felt pressured to overturn

the Grenoble vote. Much of the pressure came from a community of international activists and concerned citizens, who, for the first time during the South African situation, dominated the spotlight. Although correspondence from the international community supported both the domestic resistance and the IOC's re-admittance of South Africa to the Mexico City Games, the contingent against South Africa's re-entry was too strong, resulting in a withdrawal of the invitation to South Africa for the 1968 Mexico City Games.

During the entire 12-year period, Brundage and the IOC stood firm on three factors that shaped the responses to all 'three dominant voices' and affected the decisions leading to each Olympic Games. First, IOC responses consistently relied on Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter*, which forbade discrimination of any kind. Article 1 was the main pillar that influenced the decisions in regard to the South African situation. However, throughout the 12-year period, there were multiple interpretations of Article 1, which, in turn, affected the terms and conditions that SANOC had to abide by in order to be a participant in 1960, 1964, and 1968 Olympic Games'. Brundage believed that the *Olympic Charter* only applied to the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement. If a NOC followed the IOC rules and regulations when selecting a team to represent a country in the Olympic Games, then the NOC qualified to participate. According to Brundage, and other IOC members, a country's domestic and political matters should not be a determining factor of a NOC's admission into the IOC and to qualify for the Olympic Games. The other interpretation of Article 1, and the *Olympic Charter*, was that the rules and regulations were fundamental to the Olympic Movement and had an overarching application, that is, they applied both to the NOC and its home country.

Brundage's interpretation separated NOC and country, while the latter interpretation considered the NOC and country as one entity. Although the IOC rules and regulations were invoked in all of the discussions regarding the South African situation, they were most influential in the decision-making for the withdrawal of South Africa's invitations for the 1964 Tokyo Games and 1968 Mexico City Games.

Second, Brundage firmly defended the protocol and structure of the IOC, defining an unrelentingly formal position to provide a rationale for the IOC's actions and positions. An approved NOC is the official IOC representative of a country. A NOC approves NSFs (who are members of their respective International Sports Federations) that, in turn, recommend athletes to the NOC to represent the country in a particular sport. All athletes must belong to a NSF. The NOC makes the final decisions for the country's Olympic team and submits the list of athletes to the IOC. The NOC manages all domestic issues and the selection of the Olympic team with the ideals of the Olympic Movement and the IOC's rules and regulations in mind. Following the rules and regulations, which defines structure and protocol, guarantees a spot for a NOC in the IOC and at the Olympic Games. Each country also has one or more IOC representatives who represent the IOC in that country. Only NOCs and IOC members can communicate with the IOC, but only IOC members have voting power during the IOC General Sessions. Nonetheless, both the NOC and IOC members must follow IOC protocol. Any person or organization beyond the structure and protocol typically has no sway in IOC matters. The IOC structure and protocol were major factors in the decisions to include South Africa in the 1960 Rome Games and withdraw South Africa's invitation in the 1964 Tokyo Games.

Third, for the IOC to involve itself in political and domestic issues of any country was anathema, especially for Brundage. Throughout the IOC's existence, it had tried to remain politically neutral, allowing the *Olympic Charter* to guide the decisions pertaining to the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement. However, the traditional interpretation of the *Olympic Charter*, following Coubertin's vision, had enforced a certain structure, that when followed, potentially caused undesired repercussions. In the case of the South African situation, the sole focus on the *Charter* as a guide to decision-making kept the focus on the Olympic Games exclusively, with South Africa's political and domestic issues basically ignored. This strategy, pursued by Brundage and the IOC, implicitly left SANOC's racially discriminatory actions and South Africa's apartheid policies unchallenged, in effect contributing to the production of the kind of structural racism mentioned in the introduction of this study.

It was not until the decision was made to withdraw South Africa's invitation to the 1968 Mexico City Games that politics significantly influenced the actions of the IOC, in particular through international pressure. The IOC was fully aware of the specific political and domestic issues in South Africa over the 12-year period, but these did not play a significant role in the IOC's decisions to include South Africa in the 1960 Rome Games and withdraw its invitation to the 1964 Tokyo Games. Politics certainly influenced the outcome for the 1968 Mexico City Games.

To recapitulate, the reconstruction of the deliberations, disputes, opinions, and proclamations carried on by important actors within a network of exchanges centred on the IOC and its influential President Avery Brundage, revealed 'three dominant voices' that shaped the debate about the South African situation. Within that debate,

three factors emerged that guided the decision-making of the IOC. Identifying these three factors helped explain why Brundage and the IOC allowed South Africa to participate in the 1960 Rome Games, but withdrew the invitations to the 1964 Tokyo Games and 1968 Mexico City Games. Ultimately, SANOC did not fulfill the proposed terms, conditions, and obligations imposed by the IOC that were necessary to be included in the Tokyo and Mexico City Games'. As well, the IOC structure, and members within that structure, through their actions and resolutions during the 12-year period involving the South African situation, contributed to the reproduction of elements of structural racism.

2. Conclusions

After the 1968 Mexico City Games, South Africa and SANOC never regained the trust of the IOC or public. The influence of IOC members who interpreted the *Olympic Charter* as fundamental to the Olympic Movement, applicable to all aspects of a NOC's existence, grew. The ideal of no race discrimination in combination with domestic and international anti-apartheid forces, such as the African-Eastern bloc alliance, resulted in the final expulsion of SANOC and South Africa from the IOC and Olympic Movement in May 1970. It would take over 20 years for South Africa to rejoin the IOC and the Olympic Movement.

The IOC's experience with controversy in regard to the issue of racism and politics of race was not new. The 1904 St. Louis Olympic Games and 1936 Berlin Olympic Games serve as two examples of the IOC confronting racial discrimination before the South Africa situation, which is an example of the IOC's tacit participation in

“institutionalized racism.” Due to an interpretation of the *Olympic Charter* that allowed the IOC to ignore political and domestic issues, narrowly apply the rules and regulations to the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement, and trust NOCs to fully abide by the Olympic Charter, SANOC was permitted to field an Olympic team at the 1960 Rome Games. With that permission, and the evidence of racial discrimination, the IOC implicitly sanctioned South Africa’s behaviour. In the event, but as a result of reasons other than specifically racial discrimination, SANOC’s invitations were withdrawn from the 1964 Tokyo and 1968 Mexico City Games, which saved the IOC from explicitly having to endorse racial discrimination in the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement.

To date, the aforementioned observations based on a reconstruction of the deliberations, disputes, opinions, and proclamations found in the archival record, in reference to the South African situation, have not been delineated in the literature. Shane Quick focussed on the power shift from Brundage and the IOC to African and Third World representation.¹ Although my findings do indicate the rise of influence of the African-Eastern bloc alliance in the anti-apartheid movement, especially when the IOC succumbed to political pressure, the African-Eastern bloc alliance was one part of a larger international anti-apartheid movement. Quick’s findings were based on the correspondence of Brundage and South African officials and did not have the breadth and number of perspectives provided by my examination of the relevant archival record. The voices of other IOC and NOC members as well as the international community in response to the Grenoble vote must not be overlooked as significantly

influences affecting the eventual expulsion of South Africa from the Olympic Movement.

In Donald Macintosh, Hart Cantelon, and Lisa McDermott's study, the IOC, under Brundage's leadership, was identified as a transnational organization when dealing with South Africa in the Olympic Movement during the 1950s and 1960.² As a transnational organization, the IOC's mission was to spread Olympism through NOCs without exhibiting any interest in political ideologies. The IOC's decisions were driven by its commitment to Olympism, explaining why the IOC was interested in SANOC abiding by the *Olympic Charter*. Macintosh, Cantelon, and McDermott use records from the Avery Brundage Collection to highlight the discussions between IOC officials and SANOC officials as evidence supporting IOC's mission to spread Olympism. The authors claimed the interpretation of Olympism affected the treatment of SANOC that led to its inclusion in the 1960 Rome Games, withdrawal from the 1964 Tokyo Games and 1968 Mexico City Games, and its expulsion in 1970. Nonetheless, Macintosh, Cantelon, and McDermott were more interested in confirming the IOC as a transnational organization, not the minute details of how the change happened from one interpretation of Olympism to another that affected the decisions to include or exclude SANOC from the Olympic Games. My findings confirmed the IOC's dedication to spreading Brundage's form of Olympism throughout the world. However, within the 12-year time frame of this study, the withdrawal of South Africa's invitation to the 1964 Tokyo Games and 1968 Mexico City Games was not yet due to the change in Olympism's interpretation, but due to the IOC rules and regulations, structure and

protocol, and political pressure within Brundage's, and others', traditional interpretation of Olympism modeled after Coubertin's ideals.

In a subsequent article, Cantelon and McDermott argued for a connection between the IOC's decision-making and Coubertin's idealist vision.³ Through Brundage's and South African IOC member Reginald Honey's correspondence, the authors wanted to detail how Coubertin's idealist vision was ingrained in the IOC organization, which, in turn, influenced the decisions made when dealing with the South African situation. This study only provided a small example of one interpretation of the Olympic Movement. Brundage and Honey did share the same interpretation of the Olympic Movement, thus affecting how the *Olympic Charter* was understood and explained. However, other than Cantelon and McDermott providing some evidence of a certain interpretation of the Olympic Movement, my findings suggested that the effect of the relationship between Brundage and Honey on, and Honey's actual influence in, the South African situation was infinitesimal. There were a number of more important relationships and influential correspondences affecting South Africa's participation in the IOC, Olympic Games, and Olympic Movement.

One such relationship was between Brundage and Kenyan IOC member Reginald Alexander. Maureen Smith focused on the correspondence between Brundage and Alexander in regard to the South African situation.⁴ According to Smith, Brundage and Alexander shared a similar interpretation of Olympism and application of the *Olympic Charter*, and both men wanted to find the right solution to help the non-white sportsmen in South Africa. Garnering Brundage's trust, Alexander was appointed a member of the IOC South Africa Commission that examined the state of South African

sport, which resulted in a report that contributed to the absolute majority vote in Grenoble that readmitted SANOC into the Olympic Games. Smith's article did provide some insight on Alexander's role in the South African situation without the intricate details of Alexander's correspondence with Brundage and IOC officials. Further, Smith's examination focuses on Alexander's contributions from 1960 to 1986, investigating the role of politics of sport. In Smith's article, the coverage of the 12-year time period in my study was generally canvassed and acted as a summary of what occurred from 1960 to 1968. Again, due to Smith's narrow and succinct treatment, the amount of detail and actual scope of my findings were not present in the article.

This investigation revealed several specific aspects of this problem not dealt with in the current literature examining the South African situation from 1955 to 1968. No author has attempted to reconstruct the deliberations, disputes, opinions, and proclamations found in the archival records. A reconstruction of the material provided a detailed account of the key actors involved and the intricacies behind the decisions of the IOC in regard to South Africa's participation in the IOC, Olympic Games, and Olympic Movement. Emerging from the reconstruction are two important discoveries. First, there are 'three dominant voices' of which the IOC had to consider and negotiate: South African affiliates, domestic resistance and the international community. Emerging from the discussion surrounding the South African situation were three factors that shaped the debate and final decisions of the IOC: (a) IOC rules and regulations; (b) IOC structure and protocol; and, (c) the IOC's stance to remain inactive in political and domestic issues of any country.

The results of examining the South African situation from 1955-1968 yielded six general observations. First, the emergence of Ira Emery's private correspondence from 1961 to 1968 provided a unique insight into the development of this period. After losing the 1961 election for the SANOC Secretary General position, Emery maintained close communication with Brundage. Emery's correspondence may have served to shift Brundage's thinking on the issue, since it provided an informative inside perspective on developments in South Africa that Brundage otherwise might not have had access to. Although Emery was not referred to specifically in the correspondence as affecting Brundage's decision-making, both Brundage and Mayer referred to alternate sources of information when debating with SANOC representatives. There was no doubt that Emery was a major source of information that helped Brundage and the IOC deal with SANOC. The influence Emery had on Brundage's decisions remained unclear, but Emery was an important actor that helped Brundage have a more complete sense of the South African sporting situation, which, in turn, assisted in the preparations for dealing with SANOC. Emery was a South African figure whose importance was not highlighted enough in the existing literature.

Second, Dennis Brutus was certainly a political figure that increased awareness of the South African situation and maintained pressure on SANOC and the IOC to react to the racial discriminatory injustices in South African sport. However, in regard to affecting the decision-making of the IOC, according to the correspondence, he did not have much influence as an actor who received much attention as part of the larger group that imposed external pressure on the IOC. There was definite proof of his

advocacy for equal treatment of the non-white population in sport, but there was a lack of evidence for Brutus as a major influence in the decisions of the IOC. His reputation as an influential character in the existing literature was overstated.

Third, the correspondence, actions, and decisions of the IOC continually confirmed Brundage's interpretation of Olympism and the Olympic Movement, which indicated Brundage's influence and the IOC members' strong belief in Coubertin's vision. Brundage believed the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement were separate from all other worldly things, and if a NOC could obey and conform to the ideals, rules, and regulations of the *Olympic Charter* within the Olympic structure, it could be part of the IOC family. The consistency of the IOC's message was impeccable throughout the correspondence, however, this specific interpretation of the Olympic Movement and *Olympic Charter* did result in instances of "institutionalized racism." Allowing SANOC to participate implicitly supported the racial discrimination implied by SANOC's organization and the political context of South Africa.

Fourth, until the controversial 1968 Grenoble vote, not much credence was afforded to domestic resistance and international community debate. According to the popular interpretation of the Olympic Movement and application of the *Olympic Charter*, a NOC could have been allowed to submit an Olympic team if it accepted and abided by IOC rules and regulations. Based on that fact, it was difficult to expel a NOC from the IOC and Olympic Movement as well as deny it entry into an Olympic Games. Overturning this result could only be accomplished by changing the interpretation of the *Olympic Charter* by obtaining the support of the IOC member majority. The

interpretation of the *Olympic Charter* in the South African situation did change because of international political pressure.

Fifth, although Brundage was IOC President, and was re-elected to serve as President until 1972, the IOC was morphing into a different version of the Olympic Movement and interpretation of the *Olympic Charter*. The composition of the IOC membership was dynamic because some of the more recently accepted members integrated into the organization wanted to use the Olympic Games as a political platform. These newer members gravitated toward the interpretation of the *Olympic Charter* as being fundamental to the Olympic Movement and image of the IOC.

Lastly, the IOC was a group of individuals, not one person. Based on the correspondence, Brundage, as IOC President and the central player in the IOC, received much of the attention for the successes or failures of the IOC. Many observers were under the impression that Brundage had more control than he actually did in making decisions for the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement. As President, he could impress upon other IOC members the importance of one ideal or choice over another, but ultimately, each IOC member could raise relevant topics during a General Session and could vote for or against any resolution tabled by Brundage. Considering the tensions, and the opinions at variance with Brundage's vision of the IOC, Olympic Games, and Olympic Movement, it speaks to Brundage's resilience that he did serve another term as President after the 1968 Mexico City Games. This vote of confidence displayed the respect IOC members had for Brundage's capabilities to steer the IOC through the difficult challenges of the South African situation.

Brundage's leadership in regard to the South African situation, however, begs the question: did the IOC's actions help to save the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement or were the IOC's actions a disservice to non-whites in South Africa and internationally? As mentioned in an earlier section, *Avery Brundage and the IOC's position on Race and Sport*, the South African situation was one issue Brundage and the IOC had to confront during the 1950s and 1960s. Brundage's insistence on an amateur, non-commercial, and non-political Olympic Movement while maintaining Coubertin's ideals helped create a strong organization that contributed to the success and existence of the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement. These values guided the decisions and, in turn, the actions of the IOC in regard to the South African situation. However, the strict interpretation of the tenets and ideals that made the IOC a strong organization to survive all the controversy, ultimately, did a disservice to non-whites in South Africa and internationally. Although Brundage, and the IOC, did not want to politicize the Olympic Movement, South Africa's discriminatory laws and policies did not only violate Article 1 of the *Olympic Charter*, but these domestic affairs affected the selection of the South African Olympic team and the entire South African sport system. The racism undergirding sport in South Africa could not be prevented and Brundage and the IOC should have made an explicitly stand against apartheid much earlier than South Africa's expulsion in 1970.

3. Recommendations for Future Research

Investigating additional archival resources beyond what was used in this dissertation is a step in the right direction to create an even clearer picture of the

viewpoints of all the actors and organizations involved in the South African situation from 1955 to 1968. Analysing the archives in South Africa, more specifically, the complete records of SANOC and, if existing, the records of SASA and SAN-ROC would add to the depth of this study. A newspaper content analysis of both domestic and international newspapers discussing the IOC, SANOC, domestic resistance, and the international community would provide a better sense of public sentiments and pressure.

Projects beyond the precise focus of this dissertation include tracing and analysing the correspondence covering the South African situation within other ISFs. Perhaps various international sport organizations received correspondence from the same three 'dominant voices' that emerged in this study. Discovering what was said to other ISF officials, how certain ISF officials responded, and how the correspondence and international climate affected ISFs decision-making would develop excellent comparison material for this dissertation.

Regardless of what future research reveals in regard to the South African situation from 1955 to 1968, the IOC's decisions and actions that determined South Africa's involvement in the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement remain unchanged. Due to pressure from the international climate, the IOC opposed apartheid by suspending South Africa from the 1964 Tokyo and 1968 Mexico City Olympic Games through IOC policy and procedure, which eventually led to South Africa's expulsion from the IOC, Olympic Games, and Olympic Movement in 1970.

Endnotes for Chapter Five

- ¹ Shane Quick, "'Black Knight Checks White King': The Conflict between Avery Brundage and the African Nations over South Africa Membership in the IOC," *Canadian Journal of History of Sport* 21, no. 2 (1990): 20-32.
- ² Donald Macintosh, Hart Cantelon, and Lisa McDermott, "The IOC and South Africa: A Lesson in Transnational Relations," *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 28, no. 4 (1993): 373-393.
- ³ Hart Cantelon and Lisa McDermott, "Charisma and the Rational-Legal Organization: A Case Study of the Avery Brundage – Reginald Honey Correspondence Leading Up to the South African Expulsion From the International Olympic Movement," *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies* 10 (2001): 33-57.
- ⁴ Maureen Margaret Smith, "Revisiting South Africa and the Olympic Movement: The Correspondence of Reginald S. Alexander and the International Olympic Committee, 1961-86," *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 23, no. 7 (2006): 1193-1216.

Bibliography

1. Primary Sources

1.1 Archival Sources

Brundage, Avery. *Avery Brundage Collection, 1908-1975*. [Microfilm]. London: Information Graphics, University of Western Ontario, 1994.

1.2 Institutional Records

International Olympic Committee. *IOC Executive Committee Minutes, Volume II, (1948-1969)*. Translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg. London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992.

International Olympic Committee. *IOC General Session Minutes, Volume IV (1956-1988)*. Translations and summaries by Wolf Lyberg. London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1992.

2. Secondary Sources

2.1 Articles

Booth, Douglas. "Narrative Form: Understanding Representations of Olympic Pasts." *Olympika. International Journal of Olympic Studies* 22 (2013), 91-112.

Brichford, Maynard. "Avery Brundage and Racism." In *Global and Cultural Critique: Problematizing the Olympic Games: Fourth International Symposium for Olympic Research*, edited by Robert K. Barney, Kevin Wamsley, Scott G. Martyn, and Gordon H. MacDonald, 129-134. London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1998.

Brichford, Maynard. "Avery Brundage and the Internationalization of the Olympic Games." In *Olympic Perspective: Third International Symposium for Olympic Research*, edited by Robert K. Barney, et al., 139-143. London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 1996.

Brichford, Maynard. "Avery Brundage – the Man and the Collection." In *Sport History: Olympic Scientific Congress, July 19-26, 1984 University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon*, edited by Norbert Müller, and Joachim K. Rühl, 245-251. Niedernhausen: Schors-Verlag, 1985.

Brittain, Ian. "South Africa, Apartheid and the Paralympic Games." *Sport in Society* 14, no. 9 (2011): 1165-1181.

Brundage, Avery. "The Olympic Movement: Objectives and Achievements." *Gymnasion* 3, no. 1 (1966): 3-4.

Brutus, Dennis. "The Blacks and the Whites in Sport." *Africa Today* 17, no. 6 (1970): 2-5.

Cantelon, Hart, and Lisa McDermott. "Charisma and the Rational-Legal Organization: A Case Study of the Avery Brundage – Reginald Honey Correspondence Leading Up to the South African Expulsion From the International Olympic Movement." *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies* 10 (2001): 33-57.

Conley, Robert. "Apartheid in Sports: South African Racial Policies Seen as a Contradiction to Athletic Ideal." *New York Times*, October 15, 1963.

Cornelissen, Scarlett. "'Resolving 'the South Africa Problem': Transnational Activism, Ideology and Race in the Olympic Movement, 1960-91." *International Journal of the History of Sport* 28, no. 1 (2011): 152-166.

Gøksyr, Matti. "'One Certainly Expected a Great Deal More from the Savages': The Anthropology Days in St. Louis, 1904, and Their Aftermath." *International Journal of the History of Sport* 7, no. 2 (1990): 297-306.

Grace, Maxine. "Origin and Development of Governmental Sports Policies in the Republic of South Africa: Sport and Separate Development." In *1974 Proceedings of the Society on the History of Physical Education and Sport in Asia and Pacific Area*, edited by Uriel Simri, 107-117. Netanya: Wingate Institute for Physical Activity and Sport, 1979.

Hoberman, John M. "Olympic Universalism and the Apartheid Issue." In *Sport...The Third Millennium: Proceedings of the International Symposium, Quebec City, Canada, May 21-25, 1990*, edited by Fernand Landry, Marc Landry, and MagdeleineYerlès, 523-534. Sainte-Foy: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1991.

Honey, Andrew. "South Africa and the Olympic Movement." In *Bridging Three Centuries: Intellectual Crossroads and the Modern Olympic Movement: Fifth International Symposium for Olympic Research*, edited by Kevin Wamsley, Scott G. Martyn, Gordon H. MacDonald, and Robert K. Barney, 177-183. London: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 2000.

Hunter, Maxine Grace. "The United Nations and the Anti-Apartheid in Sport Movement." *Canadian Journal of History of Sport & Physical Education* 11, no. 1 (1980): 19-35.

International Olympic Committee. "Olympism in Action." Accessed September 16, 2014. <http://www.olympic.org/olympism-in-action>.

Jaher, Frederic Cople. "Antisemitism in American Athletics." *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies* 20, no. 1 (2001): 61-73.

Keech, Marc. "The Ties that Bind: South Africa and Sports Diplomacy 1958-1963." *The Sports Historian* 21, no. 1 (2001): 71-93.

Kidd, Bruce. "The Campaign Against Sport in South Africa." *International Journal* 43, no. 4 (1988): 643-664.

Krotee, March L. "Apartheid and Sport: South Africa Revisited." *Sociology of Sport Journal* 5 (1988): 125-135.

Krotee, March L., and Luther C. Schwick. "The Impact of Sporting Forces on South African Apartheid." *Journal of Sport & Social Issues* 3, no. 1 (1979): 33-42.

Lapchick, Richard E. "A Political History of the Modern Olympic Games." In *Fractured Focus: Sport as a Reflection of Society*, edited by Richard E. Lapchick, 329-345. Toronto: D.C. Heath and Company, 1986.

Lapchick, Richard E. "The Olympic Movement and Racism: An Analysis in Historical Perspective." *Africa Today* 17, no. 6 (1970): 14-16.

Lucas, John A. "A String of Pearls: Avery Brundage Discourses 1929-1972." In *The History, the Evolution and Diffusion of Sports and Games in Different Cultures: Proceeding of the 4th International HISPA Seminar, Leuven, Belgium, April 1-5, 1975, Dept. Lichamelijke Opvoeding, K. U. Leuven*, edited by Roland Renson, Pierre Paul de Nayer, and Michel Ostyn, 288-299. Brussel: B.L.O.S.O., Bestuurvoor de Lichamelijke Opvoeding, de Sport en het Openluchtlevens, 1976.

Macintosh, Donald, Hart Cantelon, and Lisa McDermott. "The IOC and South Africa: A Lesson in Transnational Relations." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 28, no. 4 (1993): 373-393.

Naidoo, Morgan. "Problems Confronting Our Sport." *Africa Today* 17, no. 6 (1970): 18-22.

Quick, Shane. "'Black Knight Checks White King': The Conflict between Avery Brundage and the African Nations over South Africa Membership in the IOC." *Canadian Journal of History of Sport* 21, no. 2 (1990): 20-32.

Ramsamy, Sam. "Apartheid and Olympism: On the Abolishment of Institutionalized Discrimination in International Sport." In *Sport...The Third Millennium: Proceedings of the International Symposium, Quebec City, Canada, May 21-25, 1990*, edited by Fernand Landry, Marc Landry, and Magdeleine Yerlès, 537-546. Sainte-Foy: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1991.

Smith, Maureen Margaret. "Revisiting South Africa and the Olympic Movement: The Correspondence of Reginald S. Alexander and the international Olympic Committee, 1961-86." *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 23, no. 7 (2006): 1193-1216.

Tatz, Colin. "Race, Politics, and Sport." *Sporting Traditions* 1, no. 1 (1984): 2-36.

Wright, George Vandergriff, Jr. "Racism in Sport: An Update." *Africa Today* 21, no. 2 (1974): 9-14.

Zakus, Dwight H. "The International Olympic Committee Tragedy, Farce, and Hypocrisy." *Sociology of Sport Journal* 9 (1992): 340-353.

2.2 Books

Archer, Robert, and Antoine Bouillon. *The South African Game: Sport and Racism*. London: Zed Press, 1982.

Bell, P.M.H. *The World since 1945: An International History*. London: Arnold, 2001.

Booth, Douglas. *The Race Game: Sport and Politics in South Africa*. Portland: Frank Cass Publishers, 1998.

Brichford, Maynard. *Avery Brundage Collection 1907-1975*. Schriftenreihe des Bundesinstituts für Sportwissenschaft Band 12. Schorndorf, FRG: Verlag Karl Hofmann, 1975.

Brickhill, Joan. *Race Against Race: South Africa's "Multinational" Sport Fraud*. London: International Defence and Aid Fund, 1976.

Clark, Nancy L., and William H. Worger. *South Africa: The Rise and Fall of Apartheid*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2004.

De Broglio, Chris. *South Africa: Racism in Sport*. London: Christian Action Publications, 1970.

Draper, Mary. *Sport and Race in South Africa*. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations, 1963.

Espy, Richard. *The Politics of the Olympic Games: With an Epilogue, 1976-1980*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

Guttmann, Allen. *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994.

Guttmann, Allen. *The Games Must Go On: Avery Brundage and the Olympic Movement*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.

Hain, Peter. *Don't Play with Apartheid: The Background to the Stop the Seventy Tour Campaign*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1971.

International Olympic Committee. *The Olympic Games: Fundamental Principles, Rules and Regulations, General Information*. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 1967.

International Olympic Committee. *The Olympic Games: Fundamental Principles, Rules and Regulations, General Information*. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 1962.

International Olympic Committee. *The Olympic Games: Fundamental Principles, Rules and Regulations, General Information*. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 1956.

Ramsamy, Sam. *Apartheid: The Real Hurdle: Sport in South Africa and the International Boycott*. London: International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa, 1982.

Schöbel, Heinz. *The Four Dimensions of Avery Brundage*. Leipzig: Edition Leipzig, 1968.

Senn, Alfred, E. *Power, Politics, and the Olympic Games*. Champaign: Human Kinetics, 1999.

2.3 Book Chapters

Booth, Douglas. "Sport Historians: What do we do? How do we do it?" In *Deconstructing Sport History: A Postmodern Analysis*, edited by Murray G. Phillips, 27-54. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006.

Paraschak, Victoria, and Susan Tirone. "Race and Ethnicity in Canadian Sport." In *Canadian Sport Sociology*, edited by Jane Crossman, 119-137. Toronto: Thomson Nelson, 2003.

Ramsamy, Sam. "Apartheid, Boycotts and the Games." In *Five-ring Circus: Money, Power and Politics at the Olympic Games*, edited by Alan Tomlinson and Gary Whannel, 44-52. London: Pluto Press, 1984.

2.4 Theses

Quick, Shane. "Black Knight Checks White King: The Conflict between African Bloc Nations and Avery Brundage during the 1960's." MA thesis, The University of Western Ontario, 1987.

Curriculum Vitae

Name:	Michael S. Capobianco
Post-secondary Education and Degrees:	<p>University of Toronto Toronto, Ontario, Canada 1997-1998</p> <p>Brock University St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada 1998-2001 B.Ph.Ed</p> <p>University of Ottawa Ottawa, Ontario, Canada 2001-2003 M.A.</p> <p>The University of Western Ontario London, Ontario, Canada 2003-2009, 2011-2015 Ph.D.</p>
Honours and Awards:	<p>In-Course Scholarship Brock University 1999, 2000</p> <p>Faculty of Graduate and Postgraduate Studies Scholarship University of Ottawa 2001</p> <p>Western Graduate Research Scholarship The University of Western Ontario 2003-2007</p>
Related Work Experience:	<p>Teaching Assistant University of Ottawa 2001-2002</p> <p>Teaching Assistant The University of Western University 2003-6</p> <p>Tutorial Leader York University 2006-2007</p>

Part-time Instructor
The University of Western Ontario
2008

Publications:

Capobianco, Michael. Journal article review of *The Aesthetics of the Olympic Art Competitions*, by Andrew Edgar. *Olympika* 22 (2013), 113-114.